



No 9325.73a151



GIVEN BY

THE TRUSTEES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

DEPOSITORY

82d Congress}
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION
ON
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION



SEPTEMBER 30, OCTOBER 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,
11, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

178

82d Congress}
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
U.S. PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION
ON
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION



SEPTEMBER 30, OCTOBER 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,
11, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

25356

Sbu

President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization

Washington, D. C.

JULY 2 - 1943

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

PHILIP B. PERLMAN, *Chairman*

EARL G. HARRISON, *Vice Chairman*

Msgr. JOHN O'GRADY

Rev. THADDEUS F. GULLIXSON

CLARENCE E. PICKETT

ADRIAN S. FISHER

THOMAS C. FINUCANE

HARRY N. ROSENFIELD, *Executive Director*

X9385, 73A151

REQUEST FOR TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., October 23, 1952.

Hon. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,

*Chairman, President's Commission on
Immigration and Naturalization,
Executive Office, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PERLMAN: I am informed that the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization has held hearings in a number of cities and has collected a great deal of information concerning the problems of immigration and naturalization.

Since the subject of immigration and naturalization requires continuous congressional study, it would be very helpful if this committee could have the transcript of your hearings available for its study and use, and for distribution to the Members of Congress.

If this record is available, will you please transmit it to me so that I may be able to take the necessary steps in order to have it printed for the use of the committee and Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

REPLY TO REQUEST

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, October 27, 1952.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Pursuant to the request in your letter of October 23, 1952, we shall be happy to make available to you a copy of the transcript of the hearings held by this Commission. We shall transmit the record to you as soon as the notes are transcribed.

The Commission held 30 sessions of hearings in 11 cities scattered across the entire country. These hearings were scheduled as a means of obtaining some appraisal of representative and responsible views on this subject. The Commission was amazed, and pleased, at the enormous and active interest of the American people in the subject of immigration and naturalization policy.

Every effort was made to obtain the opinions of all people who might have something to contribute to the Commission's consideration. All shades of opinion and points of views were sought and heard. The response was very heavy, and the record will include the testimony and statements of some 600 persons and organizations.

This record, we believe, includes some very valuable information, a goodly proportion of which has not hitherto been available in discussions of immigration and naturalization. It is of great help to the Commission in performing its duties. We hope that this material will be useful to your committee, to the Congress, and to the country.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. PERLMAN, *Chairman.*

C O N T E N T S

Sessions:

New York, N. Y.:

- First: September 30, 1952, morning session.
- Second: September 30, 1952, evening session.
- Third: October 1, 1952, morning session.
- Fourth: October 1, 1952, evening session.

Boston, Mass.:

- Fifth: October 2, 1952, morning session.
- Sixth: October 2, 1952, evening session.

Cleveland, Ohio:

- Seventh: October 6, 1952, morning session.
- Eighth: October 6, 1952, evening session.

Detroit, Mich.:

- Ninth: October 7, 1952, morning session.
- Tenth: October 7, 1952, evening session.

Chicago, Ill.:

- Eleventh: October 8, 1952, morning session.
- Twelfth: October 8, 1952, evening session.
- Thirteenth: October 9, 1952, morning session.
- Fourteenth: October 9, 1952, evening session.

St. Paul, Minn.:

- Fifteenth: October 10, 1952, morning session.
- Sixteenth: October 10, 1952, evening session.

St. Louis, Mo.:

- Seventeenth: October 11, 1952, morning session.
- Eighteenth: October 11, 1952, evening session.

San Francisco, Calif.:

- Nineteenth: October 14, 1952, morning session.
- Twentieth: October 14, 1952, evening session.

Los Angeles, Calif.:

- Twenty-first: October 15, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-second: October 15, 1952, evening session.

Atlanta, Ga.:

- Twenty-third: October 17, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-fourth: October 17, 1952, evening session.

Washington, D. C.:

- Twenty-fifth: October 27, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-sixth: October 27, 1952, evening session.
- Twenty-seventh: October 28, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-eighth: October 28, 1952, evening session.
- Thirty-ninth: October 29, 1952, mornings session.
- Thirtieth: October 29, 1952, evening session.

Appendix: Special studies.

Indexes:

Persons heard or who submitted statements by session and order of appearance.

Organizations represented by persons heard or by submitted statements.

Persons heard or who submitted statements by alphabetical arrangement
of names.

Subject matter.

(Page numbers may be obtained from indexes)

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1952

FIFTEENTH SESSION

ST. PAUL, MINN.

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization met at 9:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in the auditorium, State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn., Hon. Philip B. Perlman (chairman) presiding.

Present: Chairman Philip B. Perlman, and the following Commissioners: Msgr. John O'Grady, Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, Mr. Thomas G. Finucane.

Also present: Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will come to order.

This morning we will have as our first witness Rev. James E. Boren.

STATEMENT OF REV. JAMES E. BOREN, UNIVERSITY PASTOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, REPRESENTING THE COM- MITTEES ON SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION OF THE MINNE- SOTA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MINNEAPOLIS, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

Reverend BOREN. I am Rev. James E. Boren, 1628 Fourth Street SE., Minneapolis. I am a university pastor at the University of Minnesota, and I represent the committee on social education and action, Minnesota Council of Churches, and committee on social education and action, Presbytery of Minneapolis, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read, and then make a few comments.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Reverend BOREN. The plight of the world's uprooted peoples creates for our Nation, as for all nations who hold to the worth and dignity of the individual, a moral as well as an economic and political problem of gigantic proportions. Some of these people are displaced by war; others by a tyranny of government; and more recently those by military hostilities in Korea and elsewhere; as well as those who take their lives in their own hands in seeking freedom by escaping from behind the iron curtain. These individuals long for the day when they may again have the opportunity to establish homes, have the right to sup-

port themselves through honest work, and have the right to freedom of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. A further problem are the surplus peoples of the world who no longer can be supported by the economy of their respective nations. These constitute a pressure which threatens the stability and well-being of the entire world.

Our Nation for a long period welcomed the peoples of the world. You and I probably would not be here today if it had not been the policy of this Nation to provide opportunity for peoples of other nations to find justice and freedom under a democratic government. It is our belief that as a member of the community of nations we should continue this policy. We believe that the United States for moral reasons as well as for its own economic and political security should continue this policy and cooperate with other nations in meeting needs of displaced persons, refugees, and surplus populations.

There are certain steps we feel should be taken. One, on the national level, it is desirable for our Congress to adopt such emergency legislation as will allow the completion of the displaced persons program to which our Nation is committed. This legislation should provide for the admission to the United States of (a) those who were processed under the Displaced Persons Act but for whom visas were not available on December 31, 1951; (b) an additional number of persons for whom inadequate visas were issued; and (c) our fair share of those who have escaped from behind the iron curtain. We are continually urging, through our Voice of America program, that individuals escape; but to what shall they come? Shall they be no better off when they have escaped or do we have a moral responsibility to aid them in finding a homeland which they may call their own?

Two, Congress should make the quota system more flexible. This quota system should be based on the 1950 census. Further, the quota system should be made so unused quotas may be shifted to other areas. Discrimination through the quota system should be abolished as a principle not acceptable to a democratic nation.

Three, Congress should complete the process of amending immigration and naturalization so that, within the quota system, all discriminatory provisions based upon considerations of color, race, or sex would be removed. One of the most devastating attacks on our democracy was used during my years in Thailand by governments trying to incite other peoples against us by using as an argument our feeling that certain races and peoples are inferior, and not worthy of a democracy.

Four, the Congress should establish a system of fair hearings and appeals respecting the issuance of visas and deportation proceedings. There should be precautionary measures as may save our Nation from hostile action on the part of individuals who are not in harmony with the Constitution and institutions of the United States. We believe this may be achieved without imposition of measures which violate the American conception of justice.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Reverend BOREN. Now, I would like to make five comments concerning our present situation in immigration and naturalization laws.

First, I believe that it perpetuates the inequitable features of our growth by a system where it favors England, Ireland, and Germany where only about one-half of our visas are used each year.

Second, it continues discrimination between racial and nationality groups and adds new ones. It adds, for example, a place of ancestry and not a place of origin for determination of eligibility of admission to the United States. It further discriminates against those people who are members of a colony of Great Britain and/or other nations.

Third, it discriminates against those who are from the Philippines.

It further restricts immigration into the country of desirable would-be citizens. And being in the university field I know that we have had professors from other nations who have made tremendous contributions to our Nation.

Fourth, the basis of computation of quotas is out of date. We are still using a 1920 base which should be 1950.

Fifth, it provides for many new unreasonable and arbitrary bases for deportation. In one instance, for example, it eliminates the statute of limitations in many deportation cases and it creates numerous grounds for deportation not easily susceptible to judicial review. It has always been a belief in our Nation and we have always felt that there was a right for judicial review and yet in the new law there are instances when we believe this would not be possible.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand correctly that you do not favor the national origins formula in the quota system?

Reverend BOREN. That is right, sir. I would suggest, for example, at the present time in England our present quota system, as I understand the law, is based largely on northern Europeans or English, German, and Irish, and that is simply saying to the southern Europeans, "You are an inferior people."

Then, there is the Asiatic situation. I'll use as an illustration a friend of mine whose father was Siamese and mother was English. He has no chance of becoming a citizen. I understand that under the present system he could come under the 100 from Thailand.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were to have an over-all ceiling for immigrants, would you not have any quotas within that ceiling?

Reverend BOREN. I would have a quota system. I approve of a quota system. I also approve that if the quota system—for example, if the countries will not use the quotas, then other nations should be able to use them. At the present time it is cut off and it is not possible to make a shift in those. The present quota allows 154,000 people and President Truman in his message to Congress said that we now receive less than half of those. So I would make it possible for this quota system to be shifted so that other peoples could come in.

The CHAIRMAN. Within whatever number is fixed as the maximum, would you permit any applicant to come in, no matter where he comes from, provided of course he meets other tests?

Reverend BOREN. Yes, sir. I don't care where he comes from. Having been all over the world myself, in Asia and Africa, I think there are persons from all over the world who would make desirable citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Dr. Bernhardt J. Kleven here?

STATEMENT OF BERNHARDT J. KLEVEN, PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, AUGSBURG COLLEGE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Dr. KLEVEN. I am Dr. Bernhardt J. Kleven, professor of social sciences, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will be glad to hear anything you would like to state.

Dr. KLEVEN. I am speaking from my own point of view and not from the point of view of any institution, although there may be full agreement and I am still not representing them.

Mr. Chairman and the Commission: The McCarran-Walter bill seems to have been pushed through Congress with little consideration of the broader phases of immigration problems which would combine justice with our administration. That is the way I have felt about it. Perhaps too much consideration was given to protection from subversive influences, because I have wondered a good deal as to why the bill was pushed so hard when for a bill it seemed apparently dead, at least for the time being.

The law has many provisions that make for injustice as well as provisions which may have an adverse effect on our foreign policy as well as our domestic policies. Now, I do not say that all of the law is bad, but a modification of the law which will make for greater justice and reasonableness should be undertaken by the coming Congress.

I have selected for consideration some of the sections which need revision in my opinion. The national origins provision, which bases the apportionment of the total immigration for any one year on the census of 1920, is not applicable at the present time. There has been a change in the proportion of the national origins in our country since that date which should be given consideration in setting up new quotas. A more recent census base would do justice to all nationalities.

Provision should also be made whereby perhaps the full quota of some 154,000 possible immigrants could be admitted each year by reassigning the unused portions of any country which does not make use of its full quota to other countries whose quotas have been used up.

Provision should also be made by the next session of the new Congress to provide relief for the displaced persons and refugees of German ethnic origin who had been cleared by the DP authorities but who had not been able to complete fully the requirements which would have made it possible for them to come to the United States before the termination of the law. Likewise, the law should provide for immigration of our portion of escapees from behind the iron curtain, those who have a real desire to live in a society where the individual is recognized and honored. Emergency measures could well be made to admit these persons into our country as potential citizens.

I would say in general there should be screening. I might say more on that later on.

The section of the law which places a person who is "attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry" to races indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle is not only placing the Asiatics in an inferior class, according to our view, it is also a discrimination of the other half of his ancestry, whether it be British, French, or any other nationality.

It causes many hardships on many homes, which is contrary to our principles.

Now, this discriminating classification fails to give due regard to the Christian principle of equality of all peoples. The discrimination should be eliminated.

The McCarran law provides for the exclusion of aliens who have been convicted of two or more offenses other than purely political offenses, regardless of whether or not the offenses involved "moral turpitude," if the aggregate possible sentence to confinement was 5 years. This makes it possible for a person to be excluded if he has been convicted under a Nazi or Communist law which in no way involves moral turpitude. It might, for instance, be a violation of certain acts, such as antireligious law; that is, the anti-Semitism the Nazis embodied in their program.

Furthermore, a person found guilty of crimes not involving moral turpitude may be deported. It may be questionable whether deportation is the proper method to deal with such cases. In some cases of persons found to be deportable it would be difficult to know to which country he should be deported. Furthermore, if a person has lived in our country for many years and according to our laws is found to be deportable, then I say there are questions as to whether he should be deported, but I feel also that we have responsibilities to take care of those persons. I am not too sympathetic with them, but the question remains nevertheless: what should be done with them in justice and in fairness—can we just dump them out? The same question might arise regarding persons who have become public charges or committed to mental institutions from causes not having arisen after entry. Now, all of these things work undue hardships on human individuals.

A further need for revision is found in the power of final determination given consuls to grant or refuse to grant applications for admission into the United States for immigration purposes. Such power is open to abuse and subject to prejudicial injustice. There should be given opportunity for appeal to some authority or board composed of at least two persons for final disposition. This is a basic American practice. Even the most fair and conscientious consul might make mistakes, which would be corrected if appeals were made. I don't want to cast reflection on our consuls, particularly in view of all the duties they have to perform.

There appears to be no danger that admitting the full annual quota of immigrants which the law provides for would have any disturbing influence on our cultural pattern or mores. The total number would be a small percentage of our total population, and furthermore, the immigrants would be coming from many different areas and that would still further reduce any danger to our way of life. I might add here that perhaps an increase in our population to a certain extent might be beneficial economically also.

However, I believe that it is very important that we protect ourselves from admitting those immigrants which might cause a disruption in our way of life, which already has influences which would destroy our freedoms, and democracy, such as various types of totalitarianisms. I believe we should make careful selections all along the line. I think that is our duty. That is, for instance, in our screening process we should be very certain that we do not admit persons who

have been convicted or persons who have criminal tendencies. Also, subversives should not be admitted, from my point of view, and also those who cannot support themselves. Selective immigration is, I think, our duty. If we can't make ourselves strong and keep ourselves strong I don't see how we can do much for the world itself.

I think something should be done similar to that done for the DP's after they came to this country. Various welfare and church organizations and others kept in touch with them and helped them to adjust themselves and helped them to get work and they really did a wonderful service. It gave the DP's a viewpoint of our society which was favorable. I think if such a thing could be worked out for all immigrants in the future it would help us a great deal, not only the immigrants but our society too. Of course, that has been done in some cases.

I feel strongly that a general revision of the immigration law should be made only after more careful consideration of the total problem has been made than I feel was made in the case of the present revision. It would appear that we, as a member of the United Nations, should work toward a solution of the problem of overpopulation in many countries and develop a program of world-wide resettlement of these populations in areas where there is need for more people to develop the resources and thereby to raise the standard of living in those areas which are now underpopulated.

Primary consideration would necessarily have to be given to the choice of areas or countries to which immigrants might wish to go. I wouldn't disregard their wishes.

Regarding resettlement, perhaps we have had some unanticipated experiences for not a few of the resettled persons in this first resettlement, which was the only resettlement the DP authorities could take care of, went to regions and countries which do not require a quota for immigrants wishing to come to the United States and after they had been there awhile they applied for immigration into the United States. So that was only a temporary phase, the first resettlement, and many of them, it seems, had planned that to begin with. I don't know if that type of immigrant was necessarily undesirable—I don't think so—but it presents a problem.

Now, in the whole picture, of course, we are trying to ameliorate the whole position of mankind. There may be some consoling for us in our fumbling in Job's observation: that there will always be trouble for man as the sparks fly upward. But the problems are innumerable and we have to work with them and see what we can do. Perhaps we can make for more mercy in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Doctor.

The next witness is Mr. Hubert Schon.

STATEMENT OF HUBERT SCHON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNITED LABOR COMMITTEE OF MINNESOTA FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, REPRESENTING THE UNITARIAN AND UNIVERSALIST CHURCHES IN THE TWIN CITIES OF ST. PAUL AND MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. SCHON. I am Hubert Schon, 162 Bedford SE, Minneapolis, Minn.

I have been asked, Mr. Chairman, by the Unitarian Society and Universal Society to present to you a joint statement of the ~~pastors~~

of their churches in the Twin Cities. I act in this capacity merely as a messenger and with your permission will pass on this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We will make that statement a part of the record at this point.

(There follows the prepared joint statement of the Unitarian and Universalist Churches in the Twin Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn.)

THE FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 9, 1952.

Mr. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,

Chairman, President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, ministers of the Unitarian and Universalist Churches in the Twin Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., wish to express our strong disapproval of the McCarran-Walter immigration law, which was recently enacted by the Congress over the President's veto. While this law has made some needed advances over previous immigration requirements, it has added and retained more inadequacies than it has eliminated. We are disturbed by the retention of the 1920 census figure for determining quotas which means further discrimination against the countries of southern and eastern Europe and which still evidences a social and ethnic bias; by the continuance of the noxious idea of racial discrimination in which ancestry and not place of origin determine eligibility for admission to the United States and whereby the seeming humane treatment of Asiatics is still drastically limited and the situation for Negroes from such areas as the West Indies is greatly worsened; and by the continued wastage of visas through an inflexible quota system. We are even more disturbed by the hysterical departure from democratic tradition and practice, as evidenced in literacy requirements for victims of religious persecution, and the elimination in many instances of the statute of limitations, and the creation of numerous grounds for deportation that are left to arbitrary decision and are denied judicial review.

We are well aware that the whole subject of immigration is complex and difficult. Our sympathy is with those who seek to make improvements, after more than a quarter of a century, upon what have been so obviously racially inspired and economically conditioned immigration policies. We can, however, only believe that the McCarran-Walter immigration law is an affront to our friends and a comfort to our enemies, a further weakening of democracy and an added inducement to condemnation of American intentions in a critical situation.

We, therefore, urge the repeal of the McCarran-Walter immigration law and the adoption of a law, such as that endorsed in the Humphrey-Lehman bills which would pool unused quotas, eliminate racial discrimination, use a current census figure rather than that of 1920, and provide for fair hearings, judicial review, and other legal protections which are in accordance with established American traditions of fair play.

We ask this with a deep conviction that America has a prominent role to play in keeping alive the vision of refuge from wrong and advancement toward a better day. Because the Statute of Liberty faces away from America is no reason why we should turn our back upon it.

CARL A. STORM, Minister,

The First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis.

ARTHUR FOOTE, Minister,

Unity Church (Unitarian), St. Paul.

CARL OLSON, FRED A. RUSSELL, Ministers,

Church of the Redeemer (Universalist) Minneapolis.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here representing what organization?

Mr. SCHON. I am here representing the United Labor Committee of Minnesota for Human Rights, which is a voluntary organization of members of the labor movement in the State of Minnesota for the purpose—or should I say, it was founded primarily for the purpose of developing an adequate human relationship program among the over 500 local unions in the State.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those local unions affiliated with any national organization, sir?

Mr. SCHON. They are affiliated with both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. SCHON. This statement has not been approved by the executive committee of the United Labor Committee because of its inability to meet and consider the question before the hearing was held, and it must therefore be considered as an individual statement.

I have also been requested by the secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota State CIO Council to appear on behalf of the council at this hearing. I will read the letter requesting me to do so, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

(There follows the letter from the Minnesota State CIO Council, read by Mr. Hubert Schon:)

OCTOBER 9, 1952.

Re President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. HUBERT SCHON,

Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR HUBERT: The State CIO Council has received an invitation to appear before this Commission on the above-mentioned subject on October 10, 1952, at 9 a. m. in the State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn. I sincerely request that you appear in behalf of the State CIO Council at this hearing.

Sincerely and fraternally,

R. C. JACOBSON,

Secretary-Treasurer, Minnesota State CIO Council.

Mr. SCHON. The statement which I wish to read was discussed orally with the council. However, neither the council nor Mr. Jacobson, who is the treasurer, has had a chance to read it. Though in general they agree with the whole of the statement, they might take exception to one or two items.

The CHAIRMAN. When will the Minnesota council meet?

Mr. SCHON. The council has an executive meeting quarterly, and it was at their last meeting they decided they wanted to have a representation here. That was their convention, which was only about 8 days ago. So, they will not meet probably for another month and perhaps it will be longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Your committee, then. When will it meet?

Mr. SCHON. It will meet before the end of the year. It meets only periodically.

The CHAIRMAN. You will let us know if you are advised of any objections to your statement.

Mr. SCHON. Yes, sir; I will in both cases.¹

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You may read your statement.

Mr. SCHON. I. Elimination of racial and ethnic considerations: At the very time that the Government of the United States is seeking to influence the rest of the free world, and indeed as many individuals as it can behind the iron curtain, on the values of individual liberty, individual enterprise, and individual worthiness, it is by means of reaffirming the archaic patterns of racial distinctions, ethnic and national origins, negating this important concept of the free world. In other words, we are dividing the world into privileged, unprivileged, and undesirable groups by means of the present legislation instead of measuring all individuals who may wish to seek immigration visas on the basis of individual worthiness. It is recommended that meas-

¹ On October 20, 1952, Mr. Jacobson wrote that the executive board, Minnesota State CIO Council, unanimously concurs in Mr. Schon's statement.

ures be adopted that are in line with our fundamental beliefs and doctrines and that recognize the findings of social scientists during the past half century—those findings in the matter of race and ethnic origin. It would appear that a reasonable approach to a system other than the so-called national-origin system would be to yield preferences to relatives by blood or marriage of citizens and legal residents, victims of racial, religious, or political persecution, and those who possess skills considered critical by the United States Employment Service. The balance of the annual quota could well be administered on a first-come, first-served basis. That is, of course, on the basis of individual merit.

II. Asian-Pacific problem: The McCarran-Walter law discriminates and delegates an inferior status upon any person who attributes as much as one-half of his ancestry to the Asian-Pacific zones and provides that such persons, no matter where they were born, must be chargeable to the quota of the country of their Asian ancestry. Among the many other inequities of this law, its effect will be to exclude from immigration to the United States sons and daughters of American soldiers who were deserted by their fathers. It would appear that, inasmuch as these individuals are at least 50 percent Americans, in origin at least, they should attain some special treatment in being permitted to choose, prior to the age of 25, whether or not they desire to remain in their mothers' country or to immigrate to the United States with a view to becoming a citizen. As I see the law, it appears they would have to come in under the quota—100—allotted to countries such as Japan.

III. Resident aliens.

Under the new law, a host of regulations and statutes and the abolition of existing statutes of limitations create and make retroactive grounds for deportation of resident foreign-born. In effect, it well-nigh requires a resident alien to apply for naturalization. While this, in and of itself, might conceivably be considered as a desirable function, it might well jeopardize thousands of Americans who are living in foreign countries as resident aliens of those countries and thus tend to deteriorate the relations between the United States Government and other governments.

In other words, we have those thousands of Americans who are living in other countries, and it might appear that you would get into a situation where nations start competing with each other in how to be exclusive, even among nations of the free world.

IV. Judicial review: The new law introduces a number of administrative practices arbitrary in nature and not subject to judicial review. This introduces into American practice a type of bureaucratic authority criticized by almost all of our own leaders. It appears that administrative action of any individual governmental official should be subject to a review either of an appropriate judiciary or at least of a board of superior officials in the individual's own department. Some kind of review of individual officials' administrative action should be provided.

V. Escapees and refugees.

In the conflict of ideologies and patterns of value in which we as part of the free world are now engaged, the problem of appropriate and definite resettlement of escapees and refugees cannot be met under the provisions of the McCarran-Walter law. At the present the bulk

of the problem appears to be in southern and eastern Europe, where individuals residing behind the iron curtain are daily encouraged to escape by the Voice of America only to find that the quota from their country has been filled. It must be admitted that much has been done and, even under the McCarran-Walter law, can be done to permit the United States Government to assume its appropriate and proportionate role for resettling these individuals who have chosen freedom. However, the aggressor in all warfare, including cold warfare, has the principle of initiative on his side and we have no way of knowing in what area he will strike next. What has the United States to offer to refugees or escapees from Communist aggression who are from a country which has an immigration quota of 100 persons per year?

As was indicated in the introduction, every individual can rightly claim individual judgement on his own merit, which is a primary concept of American political philosophy. It appears incredibly inconsistent that we should adopt as our immigration policy a measurement of individuals according to the land of their birth, the kinkiness or straightness or color of their hair, or other purely physical characteristics.

If the United States Government is to fully assume its role as a leader of world opinion, it must achieve a consistence of practice with its own moral ethic. The over-all number of individuals admitted in any one year must obviously be controlled from time to time on the basis of the Nation's capacity to absorb them and is not here a subject of issue. However, the so-called quota system, especially one which uses the census of 1920 as a basis, is unfair and is prejudicial not only to the best interests of the United States but the best interests of freedom-loving peoples anywhere.

That completes my statement, Mr. Chairman, unless there are some questions.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. I should like to ask your view of a provision in section 212 of the McCarran Act which provides that visas may not be issued to "aliens seeking to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor, if the Secretary of Labor has determined, and certified to the Secretary of State, and to the Attorney General that (A) sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, and qualified, are available at the time * * * and place * * * to perform such skilled and unskilled labor. * * *"

Mr. SCHON. I think one of the greatest protections of American labor actually exists in the principle of seniority. In other words, those individuals who are employed have seniority under their particular contract, and I think that affords a considerable amount of protection.

The view I hold is that I think preference should be given to those skills which are critical to us. In other words, skills which are needed in our industries should be given preference to. But, on the other basis, let immigration be on a strictly first-come, first-served basis, using the basis of individual merit and worthiness of consideration primarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Dean James J. Raun here?

STATEMENT OF JAMES J. RAUN, DEAN OF NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, REPRESENTING THE LUTHERAN RESETTLEMENT COMMITTEE OF MINNESOTA

Dean RAUN. I am James J. Raun, dean of Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, 100 East Twenty-second Street, Minneapolis, Minn. I am accompanied by Millicent J. Roskilly, 2110 First Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn., and we are representing the Lutheran Resettlement Committee of Minnesota. It is a committee appointed by the different Lutheran bodies working within the State of Minnesota.

I should like to read our prepared statement, which grows out of our experience in the resettlement of displaced persons, particularly.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear it.

Dean RAUN. Until the beginning of this century, the history of this country might well be written in terms of immigration and resettlement. It is only natural that new conditions should call for new regulations in the whole field of immigration. In this attempt, however, it seems that un-American, undemocratic, and un-Christian principles have threatened to dry up and even totally choke off the source of fresh blood and life that so long has fed our American nation. Freedom's portals ceased to welcome those of many nations and creeds.

To find a more satisfactory working formula, the President of the United States has appointed a special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. On the State level, we have been asked to help seek a more just and satisfactory answer to this national problem. Many interested in this problem are conscious of the defects in the McCarran immigration bill. It denies the basic principles of the American concept of freedom and equality. It is discriminatory on the national, racial, and creedal levels.

Though he does not propound a philosophy of immigration, the President of the United States does well to remind the Commission that as a people we must remain true to our great traditions. We must have an immigration policy that strengthens our Nation at home. Always, in the aggregate, the great waves of immigration, stimulated from within, have exhibited an enlightened self-interest. Strengthened by the blood of many nations, enriched by the various streams of culture merging on her shores, uplifted by the living witnesses of varying faiths, ours has become a Nation of stout hearts and a place of refuge for the weary ones of all national backgrounds.

Secondly, as the President suggests, we must assume and retain our world leadership in this area. Immigration must continue to be the open door for the underprivileged. Regulated it must be, but regulated in a truly democratic way. The Lehman-Humphrey propositions point in that direction. Again we must show the world that we welcome those whom we invited, on an equal basis, without thought of nation, race, or creed. As we protect the rights of citizens in every sphere, so also in the field of immigration we need to be vigilant lest our morals, our ideals, our freedom be undermined and lost. In the name of all divine truths, it is incumbent upon us as a people to remove every stain of discrimination from our immigration laws. Many of the European countries look with gratitude upon this Nation because they see the open doors. No greater boost could come to our foreign

policy than the opening of these doors to all nations, according to equal laws and regulations. East and West, North and South, can add untold riches to the homogeneity of our heterogeneous national home.

Even within the smaller sphere of local State resettlement programs, we have sufficient reason to be grateful as our new citizens take a constructive place in our society, homes, and churches.

The mass immigration, experienced in the resettlement program, has been brought to a successful close. Our experiences, we believe, give ample proof that the opportunity for a new life in a Christian democracy have been repaid by the displaced persons or refugees in loyalty and devotion to their adopted homeland. Approximately 2,000 Lutheran DP's and refugees have resettled in Minnesota. Among them are occupations ranging from skilled and unskilled labor to the professional fields. Nationalities represented are Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Polish, Czech, Hungarian, and ethnic German. Country of origin has not been a factor in resettlement of the individual or family. Boys are enlisting and being drafted into the armed services, proud to be wearing the uniform of the American Army.

It is true that among these 2,000 DP's in Minnesota there have been cases of mental illness, unmarried mothers, family problems, and employment difficulties, but—and we feel this is important—their problems have appeared in much lower ratio than in the general population.

Among the principal contributions immigrants under the Displaced Persons Act have made and are making to the communities in which they have resettled are—

1. Their desire to work and determination to become independent self-supporting citizens: It has been our experience that the vast majority have eagerly gone to work, in many instances, where the job was far removed from their special training and skill as—

(a) Professor of military history from Hungary happily served as church custodian for three years.

(b) A judge from Latvia works conscientiously as ward janitor in hospital.

(c) Teacher from Estonia is in charge of hospital dining room.

(d) A pastor's wife scrubbed floors to pay for medical bills for her child.

Time after time wives and mothers have gone to work—in some instances to help other DP's; in other instances, to help pay off a down payment on a house which church organizations or individuals had advanced.

Of all moneys loaned by National Lutheran Council for inland transportation, 76 percent has already been paid.

The majority have shown the deepest appreciation for help they have received from sponsor and local church. One way in which they repay is their entering into community and church life.

2. Their work habits are characterized by dependability, versatility, high level of skill, neatness, and accuracy: Thorough training and long apprenticeship explain a high degree of competence in their fields and in adapting to new fields.

This has been especially true of power machine workers, seamstresses, tool and die makers.

A Jewish sewing-machine manufacturer was so impressed with Polish Catholic DP's already working for him that he unhesitatingly welcomed a Polish Lutheran DP into his plant with loud comment: "Those Polish boys—they're so dependable."

A Latvian foreman in high-precision work has trained other DP's and management is well pleased with his work.

3. Their joy of achievement, adaptability, and pride of country: Majority shows a desire to belong to church and to become organic members of congregations, participating in activities long before they have mastered the English language.

We have not known one who has failed to take steps to achieve citizenship. Coupled with the desire to become full-fledged citizens is the desire to learn our language, our traditions, and our way of life.

Although language is a barrier for many adults, frequently after a year grade children have hardly a trace of foreign accent in their speech. Parents take great pride in their children's ability to use the English language.

DP's in the Twin Cities have registered in large numbers for English and Americanization classes.

4. Ideals, ideas, and culture: As has always been true with immigrant groups, they cherish memories and folkways from their native countries. Each national group has brought new and interesting contributions to the community, ranging all the way from the planning of the family altar to using century-old recipes that are novelties to the neighbors.

Many craftsmen, artists, and musicians have come, bringing new art forms that have enriched their communities.

Throughout the State we have observed how, in the act of helping, volunteers have benfited by helping DP families to establish themselves. There are instances where they have overdone, as in case of the Ladies' Aid giving a woman 14 hats. However, in the main, sponsor and sponsoring agency had the objective of helping the DP's to help themselves.

Many have testified that this exercise of their Christian faith made them realize the real meaning of Christ's commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

We know that the Nation is strengthened when a community is strengthened. We have seen so much evidence that we do not hesitate to urge the following changes in the Immigration and Naturalization law:

I. That the quota system be based on the census of 1950 instead of 1920.

II. That the unused quota numbers be used for—

1. Qualified DP's under our Displaced Persons Act processed but who had not received visas before termination of the law.
2. Escapees from behind the iron curtain.
3. Religious and political persecutees.
4. Qualified persons in countries of surplus population that constitute a threat to the economic life and the internal stability of the country.

III. The quota system eventually be replaced with a new formula for selecting immigrants.

Commissioner O'GRADY. May I ask what your view of the present quota system is?

Dean RAUN. We should find a substitute that is fair to all nations. We feel this is not fair particularly to southern European nations. Whatever the law be, we feel it should be equal to all peoples.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Is Mrs. Howard M. Smith here?

STATEMENT OF MRS. HOWARD M. SMITH, STATE REGENT, MINNESOTA DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. SMITH. I am Mrs. Howard M. Smith, 2183 Jefferson Avenue, St. Paul, Minn., State regent for the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution, which is the organization I represent. We have approximately 2,000 members in Minnesota. Our national membership is about 180,000.

I might say that while I represent the Daughters of the American Revolution my grandmother was from Norway. She and her family came here, and I appreciate what the immigrants have done for our country.

I am here to testify in support of the McCarran-Walter immigration bill. I am not an expert in this matter, but I believe we should approach the situation in a realistic manner.

In a republic we are governed by majority rule. The McCarran-Walter bill was drafted after nearly 4 years of study and research, during which time anyone who wished to testify was allowed to attend the hearings and voice an opinion. The purpose of the bill is to protect the national quota system and to screen those who wish to enter the United States that we may not allow too many subversives to come. It was passed over the veto of the President by a majority of more than 2 to 1.

Why, since these nations are overpopulated, are they not fighting with us in Korea? This Korean war was endorsed by the nations of the United Nations, but we at the present time are furnishing 90 percent of the fighting men. I am wondering what effect an immense increase of immigrants would have on the labor situation. We at the present time are enjoying a prosperity and that prosperity is based in a large measure upon war production. Will our economy stand more laborers? At the present time there are approximately 1 million Americans receiving unemployment compensation.

The McCarran-Walter bill goes into effect December 24, 1952. I cannot believe that 6 days of operation is long enough a time to determine the value of this bill. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We are glad to have the expression of your views.

Is Rabbi Gunther Plaut here?

STATEMENT OF RABBI GUNTHER PLAUT, REPRESENTING THE MINNESOTA JEWISH COUNCIL

Rabbi PLAUT. I am Rabbi Gunther Plaut, rabbi of the Mount Zion Hebrew congregation in St. Paul, Minn., and I represent the Minnesota Jewish Council, 1359 Fairmont Avenue, St. Paul.

The Minnesota Jewish Council is an agency that represents Minnesotans of the Jewish faith residing in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, and a number of smaller communities in this State.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read on behalf of the council.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Rabbi PLAUT. This statement is submitted on behalf of the Minnesota Jewish Council, an agency supported by Minnesota Jewry, to work on behalf of a more secure and more democratic America.

We appreciate this opportunity to appear before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization to present our views on both of these fundamental matters. While we are in basic disagreement with many provisions of the recent codification of immigration and naturalization laws known as Public Law 414, we will address ourselves at this time to the general assumptions upon which our present immigration policies, including Public Law 414, are built.

We would like it to be made abundantly clear that this presentation pleads no special private cause. We are concerned only with such changes in our naturalization and immigration laws as would make them accord with democratic principle. There is not at present such accord.

This is not the place to recount the causes of the tragic fact that such improvement in our immigration law will neither primarily nor directly redound to the benefit of prospective Jewish immigrants, or to the special advantage of the Jewish community in the United States. More than 6 million Jews in Europe were exterminated in the name of race supremacy; another 3 million are locked behind the iron curtain with no prospect of escape. The remnants of world Jewry are tiny scattered islands throughout the world—islands shrinking in size—mostly destined for immigration to the new democratic state of Israel. Our concern with the immigration laws of our country is of an entirely different character. We feel that as representative of a large religious group of our citizenry, we can speak on these matters the more forcefully since Jews will not in any foreseeable circumstances benefit from the changes we advocate; our concern springs from motivations of a religious ethic which we believe is of vital importance for our entire Nation.

Immigration laws and naturalization laws, more perhaps than any other single kind of legislation, express a society's basic human values. They treat of the broad and fundamental relationships with people other than our immediate neighbors, of our respect for people different from ourselves. Thus, ultimately, they are an expression of man's attitude toward man—and what is better testing ground for a nation's moral outlook than this?

I

Immigration laws hold up for the entire world to see our acceptance or rejection as a Nation, of the essential quality of all human beings. It is with a sense of great tragedy that we must acknowledge that our immigration law, and particularly Public Law 414, has declared to the world that our practice as a Nation is not to correspond to our great humanitarian ideals—ideals which have been glorious symbols to a largely oppressed world.

Time does not permit a chronology and analysis of immigration legislation during the past quarter of a century or so. It may be asked: Where were we after 1924? Where was the public after the passage of that first act? Was not its quiescence indicative of agreement?

We do not believe so. We rather believe that the after effects of the First World War and the subsequent period of depression removed the question of immigration from public consideration. It was only when the gigantic human dislocations of the last decade were felt, that we took a good second look at our basic law. The very passage of Public Law 414 is evidence of the need of a second look. We regret, however, that this second look now necessitates a third.

Because we have the greatest respect for the broad human understanding of the members of this Commission, we are confident that the Commission itself will conclude that our present immigration laws, and especially Public Law 414, are not in accord with and often in contradiction with that body of social and scientific knowledge we have acquired since 1924—facts which have consistently verified the concepts of humanity and equality upon which our Nation was founded.

We are confident that this Commission will conclude that since 1924, when the national quotas formula went into force, we have maintained by default a method for the selection of immigrants which has legalized practices to which most Americans would not really wish to give consent, but which have persisted by dint of moral inertia and because after some years the halo of precedent glorified them. Now, while correcting a few of the most glaring evils, Public Law 414 reinforces others which stand as a gratuitous affront to the peoples of many regions of the world and which contradict the concepts of human equality preached and taught by every denomination in the land.

We are confident that this Commission will agree that the welfare of our Nation requires that we come to grips with those central provisions of our immigration laws which have been a source of national embarrassment in the conduct of our foreign policy and which have produced immeasurable heartbreak, injustice, and waste. To be sure, Public Law 414 has abolished sex discrimination and has made a gesture in the direction of broader human equality, but both advances are overshadowed and nullified by the contrivance and even intensification of policies which cry for abolition.

II

One of the points upon which our present immigration law turns, and this is certainly true of Public Law 414, is the national quotas formula, adopted in 1924.

It has long since been the time to repudiate not only the national quotas formula, but more importantly, to repudiate once and for all the irreligious prejudice and moral falsehood upon which such policy is founded.

The late Senator Reed, who introduced the national origins formula, and who served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration which finally passed it into law made the motivation of the national origins formula distressingly clear. He said:

I think most of us are reconciled to the idea of discrimination. I think the American people want us to discriminate * * * our duty is to the American people and we owe no duty to be fair to all nationals.

The national quotas formula is based upon the demonstrably false assumption that racial groups other than those of the Anglo-Saxon peoples would contaminate the peoples of this country; and the equally patent falsehood that non-Anglo-Saxons would be detrimental, if not fatal, to the creation of a distinctively American tradition.

It is shocking and frightening beyond expression that we should incorporate into law today, as we have done with Public Law 414, the horrible myths of race supremacy and race superiority. We are confident that this Commission, if it does nothing else, will once and for all press for the excision of these racist fictions from our body politics. We ask nothing else but that our country, which prides itself—and rightly so—on its loyalty to the dictates of scientific knowledge and discovery, as well as its adherence to the moral law, should no longer base so significant a portion of our legal and legislative structure on foundations so thoroughly and irrevocably exploded by science and research and so unequivocably denied by every religious and moral tenet.

Our strength as a nation has not depended merely upon our great material riches. But it has depended far more upon our diversity of peoples and cultures and upon our unique ability to fashion a creative national unity out of that diversity, without penalizing the differences. The American people have not been nourished at a single font; it has drawn from many springs and it must continue to draw from many springs if it is to remain strong.

While it is true that we Americans have an obligation to protect ourselves against those who seek to enter the United States for purposes of subverting our democratic system of government, we cannot allow ourselves to be party to a law, such as Public Law 414, which poorly disguises its hostility to all immigration and all immigrants. Further, our strength and vigor as a nation has come, in large measure, from the polyglot peoples, the cast-offs of other nations who fled the autocracies of other lands to build a stronghold of freedom here in America. I read Public Law 414 and then I read the inscription on the Statue of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, etc., etc.,". Which expresses better the spirit of America? Can there be any doubt?

To be sure, the free immigration of 1900 cannot today be reinstated. We must have limitations, and we must have some preference within the limits of such legislation. We must have protection from foreign subversion. But our methods to achieve these ends must not be in glaring contradiction to our basic human principles.

While preference should be shown for relatives of citizens or legal residents, and for victims of racial, religious, or political persecutions, and for those possessing special skills, the fundamental immigration policy must become one of deliberate exclusion of religious and racial criteria as a basis for admission to American citizenship. It should be clear, too, that our advocacy of the abolition of the national origins quota system does not entail increasing the number of immigrants to be admitted yearly. The total number of immigrants we can absorb is a matter for scientific determination. What we are advocating here is a democratic policy—which we feel is a policy of wisdom—for the admission of whatever number of immigrants are allowed, be that

number 150 or 150,000—a policy that will erase the blot of racism from the escutcheon of American freedom.

The question persists: How many people shall be admitted—and what shall be done with unused quotas? Our answer is that all national quotas should be abolished, and that there be one single yearly quota. Prospective immigrants should be chosen by our central consular authorities on the basis of over-all need. This would be a bold departure from present policy, but ultimately the only one which we can justly adopt.

Let us assume for the moment that our present annual allotment of 154,000 is a desirable figure. This represents one-tenth of 1 percent of our total population. If we mean what we say—namely, that we are willing to admit an additional one-tenth of 1 percent every year to our shores—then why not be unequivocal in our action and law? Let us then not deceive ourselves into a false sense of generosity by setting quotas for the English which we do not expect to be filled. What moral justification is there in charging up the needs of our generation against possibly greater needs of tomorrow? What can we say before our own conscience when we face up to the fact that no further “normal” immigrants from Latvia can come here until the year 2274?

III

We further respectfully submit, that distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens in our immigration laws must be eliminated as contrary to the spirit of the Constitution.

In a democratic republic such as we are building in America, there is no room for any form of limited citizenship. This has been axiomatic in American law since the days of Chief Justice Marshall who laid down the principle, never since challenged, that the grant of American citizenship is not a partial grant upon a condition subsequent.

But Public Law 414 flouts this time-hallowed principle. It introduces a note which should have been forever repugnant to American practices, even as it is repugnant to American ideals.

We trust this Commission will urge upon President and Congress that it face squarely the issues posed by the legislative creation of legal castes in America, and that we do not await a decision of the Supreme Court to nullify these sections of our immigration code as being contrary to our Constitution.

IV

Finally, we would like to place on the record our belief that fundamental to the American system of justice is that each person shall be accorded a fair hearing.

This is so much a part of the American ideal of justice that we sometimes tend to ignore the invasions, subversions and corruptions of it. Yet we are presented, in Public Law 414, with major legislation which denies immigrants the right of appeal either to a board of immigration appeals or a visa review board, but which, to the contrary, explicitly denies such opportunity for further inquiry to any alien who may appear to the examining officer to be excludable.

This, we submit, is European bureaucracy but not American justice. The future of human beings, of entire families, must not be so dependent upon the judgment of a single individual. To do so is far more than justice demands, and certainly far more than our security requires.

We are confident that this Commission will recommend the establishment of a board of immigration appeals and a visa review board as reasonable requirements of a fundamental area of law.

V

In concluding this statement presented on behalf of the Minnesota Jewish Council we want to commend the President of the United States for his wisdom in establishing this Commission to inquire into matters of immigration and naturalization. We have full confidence that it will lead the way in the development of an immigration policy and law which will extend and encourage the growth of American justice and American humanitarianism. We pledge our support and assistance to this Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Mr. Lowell Eastlund here?

STATEMENT OF LOWELL EASTLUND, REPRESENTING THE DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. EASTLUND. I am Lowell Eastlund, and I represent the Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars, 511 State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. EASTLUND. I was not informed until yesterday of this meeting. I received a press release the day before. In the meantime I tried to check into the angles of the McCarran Act and I checked back into our resolutions and into the action of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and found that we had taken no official action.

We are naturally concerned as individuals with the humanitarian aspect of the situation, but we are also concerned about the possibility of any new law or any present law which would not provide for sufficient screening and discrimination against the type of person who is brought in here. Our concern in this is more on a patriotic viewpoint than it is from a humanitarian viewpoint. That is inherent in the make-up of our organization. We believe that any law which would permit a person in who will do harm to the country would nullify the good that is done by allowing in even a thousand persons whom we could help.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course we are anxious to keep out subversives. Could your organization make any suggestions as to how the present law could be strengthened in order to make certain that no subversives are admitted to the United States?

Mr. EASTLUND. Possibly the organization could. I couldn't, because I have not had a chance to confer with the people who have made a study of this and have taken any action.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other suggestions you wish to make regarding the act?

Mr. EASTLUND. I am not familiar with the McCarran Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Eastlund, for coming.

Our next witness will be Mr. Douglas Hall.

STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS HALL, REPRESENTING THE HENNEPIN COUNTY CIO INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL

Mr. HALL. I am Douglas Hall, an attorney, 211 Produce Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. I am authorized to appear this morning on behalf of the Hennepin County CIO Industrial Union Council, which covers roughly Minneapolis and some suburban communities. The council is composed of delegates from CIO unions in Minneapolis and the suburban areas.

I don't want to make any further comments on the quota system and the racist implications in our present immigration and naturalization laws because that has been covered beyond my ability to add to it. It suffices to say that the CIO and the CIO in Minneapolis concurs in the statements that have been made in criticism of the present laws on those grounds.

I would like to urge this proposition on the Commission as basic to the formulation of what I would hope would be a new approach to the whole problem of immigration and naturalization. We start with the constitutional proposition that the power of the Congress over immigration and naturalization is a plenary power. That is commonly derived from the concept of national sovereignty. Since the Congress has the authority to exclude anybody from this Nation, it has the authority to establish what standards it wishes. It seems to me that that is an outmoded concept of sovereignty and that we would best express the ideals of this nation if this Commission would recommend a new concept; that in the adoption of immigration and naturalization laws it is a policy of our democracy to extend that democracy to the world. The plenary power argument has been used to say that as long as we have the power to keep everybody out we don't have to extend the constitutional protections for those we consider for admittance and for those we wish to exclude. But I would urge this Commission to recommend a new concept of sovereignty and to consider the specific provisions of immigration and naturalization laws which are complex in the light of a new concept and not this old plenary power argument as it has been applied.

I would like to direct some specific remarks on the deportation aspect of the immigration laws because I think that the plenary power argument has been worked to death in that particular field. To the extent that principles of due process have been applied in deportation and naturalization hearings the courts have wrung from the Congress and from the administrative agencies the adherence to due process concepts and it has only been because of the courts that we have to the extent that we have now due process. Of course, as you gentlemen know, due process in deportation procedures is a procedural matter and not a substantive matter. It seems to me that it is a principle of our Nation that substantive due process should also apply to the consideration of human problems.

I think specifically that the proposition that is established in our present laws that ground for deportation which exists at any time after entry can after 25 or 30 years or longer be relied upon to deport

a father or husband and to break up a family, even though there is no present finding that that ground which came into existence many years ago did exist—and I apply that particularly to the political cases, membership in any prescribed organization—should be adjusted. It seems to me that this Commission should recommend the principle in the new legislation that the Government has the responsibility to find out now at the time the deportation proceeding is in effect whether or not that individual still retains his prescribed views or his prescribed associations and that the mere automatic fact that he at one time was a member of a prescribed organization should not in 1952 be an automatic basis.

You are probably familiar with the cases of where during the depths of the depression men and women joined organizations that are now proscribed as subversive and remained affiliated only for a short time and did not participate in the ideological aspects of those organizations. They looked upon them for assistance in relief problems. Still that short membership, regardless of a person's record time, is basis for deportation and destruction of their lives.

I would urge that the law provide a basis for investigation into the merits of each individual case so that you do not have automatic injustice.

Another aspect of this thing is the removal of the period of limitations, so that in some situations where there are not serious violations of the regulations there is no statute limitation, and there is no period beyond which those are outlawed.

Another problem I would urge the Commission to give very serious consideration to, is the question of bail. It seems to me that the large discretion given to the Attorney General on the granting of bail in these cases, is a very serious breach of our normal procedures, and to put it bluntly, it seems to stem from the proposition which is well established that these are not criminal proceedings; and so the alien who is apprehended on a warrant for deportation, who is lodged in jail, and is denied bail, has the gloomy satisfaction of knowing that he is not charged with a crime; that is, he is not a criminal, but he still is lodged where criminals are. And I think that the courts generally—it has been my experience in this area—that the courts generally have a more humane and common-sense approach to this question than the administrative offices do, and that judicial review is a safeguard against a system of injustice, and specific cases of personal hardship.

I feel that once bail is granted that the Government should have the burden of establishing cause for revocation of bail; that the alien should not be apprehended again and lodged in jail, and then have the burden of showing that he has not done anything in the meantime, that the Government should have the burden of saying "this man by his conduct has forfeited his right to bail." I think those are the specific things I wanted to use to illustrate that first concept, that as an exercise of our sovereignty we should apply in immigration and naturalization the basic principles that we apply to our own citizens and that we should not rely upon an outmoded theory of sovereignty to discriminate.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Mr. F. W. Nichols here?

**STATEMENT OF F. W. NICHOLS, ACTING DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL
WELFARE, STATE OF MINNESOTA**

Mr. NICHOLS. I am F. W. Nichols, 117 University Street, St. Paul, Minn., acting director of social welfare of the State of Minnesota.

I have made no study of the act which we are considering, and I am not attempting to comment on it as far as that is concerned. I merely wanted to present our experience as a central agency for the displaced persons program, which we are under the law that is recently expired; I merely wanted to report to you that in our work the many religious agencies that were affiliated in that program and with our welfare boards we have had no serious difficulties in the absorption of the people that were brought over here under that act.

One point we did want to make was to a very minor extent we did find some cases of tuberculosis, which happens to be administered through our department, and to suggest that in any planning for them probably a more adequate screening of the medical aspects would be advantageous particularly in a State like this that has a long history of trying to improve the care of people, the bringing in of other active cases is a matter of some concern. But in the main our experience has been very satisfactory, the sponsoring agencies, the various religious groups have done a good job of absorbing them in the communities, the communities have accepted them. In the over-all plan if younger people can be added in a State of this kind which has a population of about 3 million with some 20 percent over 55 years of age, it would no doubt add to the general benefit of our general manpower condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nichols, how many displaced persons came to Minnesota?

Mr. NICHOLS. The secretary of our State displaced persons commission, Mr. Poor, says over 7,000 came into the State.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. May I ask one question, Mr. Nichols? You said 20 percent of Minnesota's population was over 55.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is right.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Is that a higher proportion than that of surrounding States?

Mr. NICHOLS. I haven't looked at the surrounding figures.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Has that been rising; has it been a rising figure recently?

Mr. NICHOLS. It has risen 25 percent in the last 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Leonard H. Heller here?

STATEMENT OF LEONARD H. HELLER, REPRESENTING THE REFUGEE SERVICE COMMITTEE OF THE JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HELLER. I am Leonard H. Heller, 1838 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, and I am appearing here this morning on behalf of the refugee service committee of the Jewish Family Service of St. Paul, and I understand that the remarks that I make are intended to cover the situation in Minneapolis as well as St. Paul.

In 1939 I went to New York at the urging of some community leaders here, and we formed a refugee service committee to help in

resettlement of those victims of Nazi persecution that could be gotten out of the country. Our committee has continued in force, with the exception of the war, until this date. At present the service programs of the refugees resettlement program are supported by the community chest in both cities, and in both Minneapolis and St. Paul the money that's spent for furniture and resettling and transportation and food, and medical expenses and food and what not, is repaid by the refugee service committee, in other words, by the Jewish community. I don't have the figures for Minneapolis, but in St. Paul we have spent upward of a quarter of a million dollars in the actual expenses of resettling refugees since 1939. My figures are all for St. Paul, and Minneapolis I think you can assume half again as large in each case.

Prior to 1946, I believe about 200 individuals were resettled in St. Paul. Since that date our figures in St. Paul are accurate. We have resettled 253 family units, about 600 individual cases.

In St. Paul or Minneapolis, under the guaranty system that we had for some time, I believe that almost every Jewish citizen who was capable of providing a satisfactory financial picture did guarantee that the refugees that came in under their guaranty would not become a public charge. I know myself that I made out three or four of them, and everybody did. To my knowledge not one did become a public charge.

I want to say this, too, before I get to the points that I object to in the act: That of the refugees we have resettled here, every one has applied for citizenship; every one has become a citizen after the required time has elapsed; with the exception of a few widows with small children and a few aged persons, all of our new residents are gainfully employed. Not one has become a public charge; not one has run afoul of our laws. Juvenile court records in St. Paul, at least, don't reveal that any refugee child has been guilty of any serious mischief. The record does not show any.

The first point I want to make is this: That in our experience there is no difference in the assimilative abilities of refugees from the high-quota countries and those from the low-quota countries. We see not one bit of difference. Under the new act, the quota for Poland, for instance, would be relatively small, while that from Germany is considerably larger. I have in the prepared statement I will leave with you, two cases that are illustrative of what I mean. Two families, one from Poland and one from Germany, both resettled in St. Paul; they both have made remarkable adjustments, and they both are on their way—I believe one is now a citizen and one is on his way to becoming a citizen. We believe we are in a position to know that there isn't any difference at all in the rate or the desire of people from the low-quota countries as contrasted with the high-quota countries, in their desire or ability to become citizens. We object to the other view very strenuously, and I can't, I believe, put it any stronger than that. It has no basis in fact.

The second point I wanted to make is in regard to the suspension of the statute of limitations in the case of our new residents. We see no validity and much harm in the fact that the statute of limitations is suspended, and that people who are here in this country are in jeopardy because of that fact, and that the interpretation of what constitutes a crime is left in the hands of our bureaucrats, and our

consular officials, in foreign countries. We believe that is particularly unfair. We think that it will result in keeping a good many worthy people from coming to the United States. We think it is unduly restrictive, and of course we object to it. We foresee the possibility that a new resident may be deported before he actually becomes a citizen in the 5-year period, and although it hasn't happened we see the possibility of a new resident having his citizenship delayed for very unstable reasons, technical reasons of one kind or another, and we want to point out that until that person becomes a citizen he is in danger of being deported. We don't know from actual experience any of our new residents who have actually violated the law and been sentenced to punishment in the land from which they came, and yet we feel that that situation may be present not in one case or two cases but maybe in a lot of cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you thinking of instances where a person might be charged with the commission of an act in his own country which would not be regarded as a crime here?

Mr. HELLER. Yes, I am thinking of that as one phase of a bad situation.

I am thinking of a new resident who may be on the verge of getting citizenship, and it then comes to light, for reasons which I wouldn't know, that that person had committed an act in his own country, in the country he came from, a punishable crime, and in that case until citizenship was granted, as I understand the new act, that person is subject to deportation. I don't know what the proof will be—the act hasn't been in effect—but I do know, as I read the act, and as I read the interpretation of it, that in the selecting of immigrants to come to this country, the word of our consular agent or our immigration agent in the home country is more or less conclusive. I think this is a pretty tough situation.

I recall, just prior to the war, that I was on the point of getting a young lady out of Vienna and into this country, a young lady named Cripple. I remember it very well; she was a kindergarten teacher and the thing looked all in order and I had every reason to believe she would come with another member of her family—the name escapes me, but her brother or sister who was coming—and one of our persons in Vienna unwound the red tape. The girl never got here. The last word I had from her was about the last letter I saw out of Vienna, at least, and about that time everything bad that could happen to anybody happened to her; now Hitler did the dirty work, but it seems to me that the overreaching of our own consular agency kept that girl from coming to the United States, and, of course, she and her family are dead today.

The third point that we want to make in objection to the new act is the fear, the uneasiness, that it has engendered in the minds and in the hearts of the people who are in St. Paul and Minneapolis at the present time. These people have come, as I told you, and they are good citizens; they are self-supporting in most cases; they are working; they are doing everything they can to make our home their home.

Since the act was passed and the attendant publicity to it, there has been an uneasiness. Some of them want to know: "Will I ever get my citizenship?" They have something in their mind, unquestionably, that they don't tell us about: "Will my citizenship be delayed? Will

I be able to get my brother over? I have been saving to get somebody else over; will they be able to come?" A veritable wall of fears in these people's hearts and in their minds and they have got enough to worry about already. I think that's inevitable in a piece of legislation that is as obnoxious as this, and it is obnoxious; the vote in the Senate was very close as I remember it. My son wrote a rather strong letter to Senator Thyre objecting to the terms of the act. He didn't answer until he had voted in favor of it, at which time he admitted quite frankly that the act was bad, many objectionable features in it, but he thought it was better to pass an Immigration Act and trust that amendments could be had in the act at a later date that would remove some of its objectionable features. If that is the attitude of one Senator it seems to me it may be the attitude of a good many. In other words, we have a very bad act on the statute books which even the proponents admit is bad and they are depending upon amendments to straighten it out. It is locking the barn door after the horse is gone.

That is all I have to say and I would like to submit my prepared statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Your prepared statement will be inserted in the record.

(The prepared statement of Leonard H. Heller, representing the refugee service committee of the Jewish Family Service, follows:)

My name is Leonard H. Heller. I have been a resident of St. Paul for the past 30 years. Prior to that time I lived in Minneapolis for over 20 years. I am a citizen of the United States and a World War I veteran. My principal business interests are in Minneapolis. For the past 30 years I have taken an active participating interest in matters of social welfare. At present I am a board member of Elliot Park Neighborhood House in Minneapolis and the Jewish Family Service of St. Paul as well as a board member of the United Jewish Fund and Council of St. Paul. My interest in matters of this kind has not been entirely local. I am a board member of the National Association of Settlement Houses as well as the national budgeting committee of the Community Chest organization. Quite naturally, I am active in Community Chest fund-raising activities.

It was, I believe, in 1939 that I went to New York at the urging of some Jewish community leaders in St. Paul to investigate ways and means whereby the St. Paul Jewish community could participate in the resettlement of refugees from Nazi Germany. As a result of this trip and the interviews I had in New York, we formed the Refugee Service Committee of St. Paul. I have served as a chairman of the committee which, in recent years, has been a branch of the Jewish Family Service a good deal of the time. Since the war, the service expenses of the refugee program have been the responsibility of the Community Chest but the direct expenses for relief, transportation, clothing, etc., are and always have been considered the responsibility of the United Jewish Fund and Council of St. Paul and upward of a quarter of a million dollars has been spent since the inception of the program by our St. Paul people in the project. I am certain that I speak for the whole Jewish community of St. Paul when I say that nothing has been or could be as satisfying as the remarkable results we have achieved in this field of resettling the unwanted, the persecuted, the sick, the aged, and infants cast off by Europe's dictators.

I well remember when immigration could be accomplished only via the personal affidavit. In those years virtually every Jewish citizen of St. Paul, able to present to our State Department a passable statement of his financial solvency, undertook to guarantee that one or two, or possibly five, families would not become public charges. There was a lot of red tape—but our people did it willingly; yes, eagerly. I recall the days of the corporate affidavit when St. Paul Jews rushed to absorb far more than their share of the residents of the Oswego camp.

Our records are not complete before 1946 but I believe about 200 refugees settled in St. Paul prior to that year. Since 1946 our figures are accurate; 253 family

units have been brought to this city, just short of 600 individuals, and note these facts:

Every one has applied for citizenship.

Every one who has been here the required time has become a citizen.

With the exception of some widows with small children and a few aged persons, all of our new residents are gainfully employed.

Not one has become a public charge.

Not one has run afoul of our laws.

Juvenile court records reveal that not one child has been accused of serious mischief.

All have diligently studied to learn English.

I would like to devote the major portion of my allotted time to discussion of those objectionable features of the McCarran-Walter Act wherein I have first-hand knowledge.

My first point is that the national origins provision of the act is discriminatory and will exclude highly desirable persons. Following are two thumbnail sketches of actual cases from the records of the refugee service committee of the Jewish Family Service. One family is Polish and would likely be excluded because the quota for Poland is small. One family is German and would likely be allowed to enter because the German quota is large. Yet both families made excellent adjustment to their new surroundings.

One day last October a 12-year-old girl walked shyly into the first grade of the Jefferson School of St. Paul, found a place among the 6-year-olds in the class, and sat down to learn her ABC's. She towered head and shoulders above the other youngsters in the class and the boys and girls looked questioningly at the teacher, as if to ask whether this big girl belonged there. The teacher smiled and nodded. Yes, Susan Woller, just off a boat from a DP camp in Germany, did belong there.

One day last week Susan Woller walked proudly into the sixth grade of the same school and took her rightful place among children her own age. In 3 months Susan had grown from a shy youngster who knew not a word of English, to a confident young lady who had learned enough reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and American history to hold her own with all other 12-year-olds in her new homeland.

Between October and last week lays the dramatic story of a child and her family who made their start in a new life. Herman Woller and Sara Woller, Susan's parents, had been born in Minsk, Poland, but they had spent most of their lives in Wilna and Kovna. Before the Nazi persecution, Mr. Woller had owned an apparel shop and Mrs. Woller worked in the business as a seamstress. They led a well-ordered, fairly prosperous, middle-class life. From 1943 to 1945 the family was in a concentration camp in Stugholz, Germany. Liberation brought the Wollers to a DP camp in Munich and from there a community assurance given by a St. Paul family brought the family to this country. The Wollers, like others among our new neighbors, don't like to talk too much about their concentration and DP camp experiences. The passion to be like other people is revealed in what the family has done since coming to St. Paul. Mr. Woller went to work as a tailor 3 weeks after his arrival and a week later Mrs. Woller found employment as a seamstress in a St. Paul department store. The parents also went to school. Two nights a week at the International Institute plus twice a week with a private tutor left little time for anything else, but the Wollers did learn English quickly.

The Wollers say they are pleased with St. Paul. They have their own apartment and they have found some friends. But above all, they find in the progress Susan has made a warming illustration of the potentialities which American life can hold for our new neighbors.

Mr. Herman Jacob came to St. Paul with his wife on a community assurance some years ago. At first glance and even after close inspection, Herman Jacob looks as though he had lived here all his life. Speaking English as fluently as any of the teachers who tutored his fellow newcomers, well dressed, poised, and exuding an air of quiet confidence that comes from having been a successful person all his life, Mr. Jacob could have passed for a St. Paul businessman. How did Herman Jacob fit into this scheme of things? Did he have trouble because he had no skills to be a useful person? Twenty years of employment in an import business and then ownership of a taxi business operating a fleet of cabs does not suggest a person who couldn't do things. In 1933 the Nazis revoked his business license when it was decreed that Jews could no longer engage in a public service. Because it was hard to get any other kind of work he took a job driving a cab on the night shift. But in 1938, after 5 years on a cab every night, the Nazis denied him even that privilege by revoking his chauffeur's license. Mr. Jacob tells of the

fact that almost every night he saw bands of Nazi hoodlums painting "Jude" on the windows and pavements of Jewish shops. Sick at heart and foreseeing the events to come, Mr. Jacob and his wife left Berlin for Shanghai in late 1938. For the next 8 years Herman Jacob managed a large movie house, supervising a staff of 15 persons and learning the ins and outs of the movie trade. During his last 2 years in Shanghai Mr. Jacob worked as a clerk for the United States Army. The Jacobs returned to Germany in 1947 to see their few surviving relatives and to arrange immigration to the United States.

Two months without work may not seem so long but it was a long time for a man who yearned to be independent and who fears that because he is 55 years old the doors of employers may be closed to him. "You Americans," said Mr. Jacob, "have a saying that a man is only as old as he feels. Starting all over again is not new for me. I did it at the age of 20 when I went to China for the first time. I did it years later when I returned to Berlin to go into the import business. I began at the bottom rung in Shanghai in 1938. I can do it again, but I need a chance." Mr. Jacob indeed did it again. Shortly after this history of the family was written, a matter of 3 years ago, he found work with a large retail establishment. He is now doing inventory control work for the same company and, as might be expected, he is doing it well.

I repeat, we see no validity in the national origins features of the act, no difference in the capacity and desire for citizenship, or the speed of adjustment.

My second point deals with the hazard that results from the fact that, under the terms of the act, the statute of limitations has been suspended and our new residents can, under foreseeable conditions, be deported until the day of their death for a violation of the law of the land of their origin. I stated that some 600 Jewish persons had come to live in St. Paul since 1946. I stated that none of them had become involved with the laws of our country. Do I know, do you know, does anyone know whether or not any or all of them may not have run afoul of the crazy Nazi or Communist laws under which they were forced to live? It seems reasonable to suppose that some may have committed so-called punishable crimes in order to exist or possibly they broke the law in order to get transportation to some point where emigration to the United States was possible. But our new immigration law is clear: If the law (and not necessarily a just law) was broken, deportation may result at any time. Our consuls or immigration inspectors are granted the authority to determine what act constitutes a crime. Are they trained or equipped to determine whether crimes committed under the laws of a foreign country involve moral turpitude as our American standards define it?

I presume this is a feature of the law that even some of its proponents gagged at. In a letter to my son in July or early August Senator Edward Thye said, in explaining his vote in favor of the bill, that it had many objectionable features but he thought these could best be corrected by subsequent amendments rather than by defeat of the measure. Senator Thye has often felt that the best time to lock the barn door is after the horse has made off.

We citizens of St. Paul resent and utterly reject the idea that our hundreds of new and completely assimilated residents must be kept in constant fear that they may at any time be confronted with some alleged but long-forgotten law violation. May I add that we are well aware that the strong probability does not exist yet the possibility remains. All bureaucrats and government officials are not benign, not even those employed by the United States. Somewhere, and probably in an Austrian graveyard is a woman who might by this time have been a full-fledged citizen, and a useful one, had it not been for an overreaching United States consular official. I prepared the affidavit. I remember the case.

Finally, I want to have you consider the worry, the strain, the anxiety, that this legislation engenders with these newcomers already here. Many are working, studying, saving, with the hope of one day bringing a relative, friend, or a former associate to this country. Since the act was passed, many of them have come to our office expressing their serious concern as to whether this hope can be realized. Others fear, and with justification, that they themselves may be denied citizenship or that they will be subjected to further investigation and delay. These are hard-working, upright people—good neighbors. It is wrong to subject them to further ordeals. Their children have done well in our schools, and, incidentally, our schools have done well for them. A few days ago a teacher stopped a social worker to inquire the whereabouts and progress of two former refugee students, to whom she said she felt a deep personal attachment. Another teacher, and not a Jew, has become a foster parent for one of the children brought here under the orphan children's program.

I hope I have not been unduly long-winded in presenting our reasons for urging repeal or revision of the new immigration act. My plea is on behalf of

the St. Paul Jewish community, its residents and citizens, new and old. My statement has been limited to practical objections and only those wherein we have had first-hand knowledge and experience.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the Reverend Campbell here?

STATEMENT OF REV. WILLIAM J. CAMPBELL, PASTOR OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, AUSTIN, MINN., REPRESENTING ALSO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF AUSTIN, AND FRANK SCHULTZ OF THE CIO PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Reverend CAMPBELL. I am the Reverend William J. Campbell, pastor of the Methodist Church, Austin, Minn. I represent the Jewish community of Austin today, as well as a good many people in the Methodist Church, and Mr. Frank Schultz of the CIO Packinghouse union, who is unable to attend due to the tragedy that befell his family in a fire yesterday morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we understand, then, that you represent generally all the people of Austin, Minn., no matter what denomination or what trade or industry?

Reverend CAMPBELL. Well, a good many of them. I wouldn't say all of them. There may be some that, like a great many people, I know are just somewhat confused, probably like some of the Congressmen and Senators who passed this act. I haven't read it all.

As I have gone through this act, and read portions of it, and scanned a number of the parts of it, I have discovered that there is something about the act that I object to as a Christian minister, for I believe that we violate the spirit of what we are attempting to do. The act, as I understand it, is attempting to oppose all totalitarianism, and as I read the act, I discover that some of the things which we object to most in totalitarianism are found in the act itself.

First of all, the whole matter of racism, where it purports to do away with that by allowing the people in the Pacific triangle to have a small quota, in the next breath the act, in section 202 (b) I think it is, sets the limit so that anyone born of Asiatic parentage or half-Asiatic parentage anywhere in the world will be included in that quota, and that to me, of course, is racism, and nothing more or less than that, and I believe that that violates the spirit of our Nation, even as the old immigration laws have violated it, and I am against it, and I think that a great many people in our community in Austin are against it on the basis of principle; that this is not an American approach to this situation; that this is not a Christian approach; that this is not a Jewish approach; this is not a democratic approach, and we are a Christian society with democratic principles and I believe that this act ought to clear with those principles. We are very much concerned about that at the present moment, and I feel that this act ought to be rewritten in certain places so that it does clear with the basic principles of our democracy.

Then, I have a young couple in my church who have had friends, they have been in Europe, and they have had friends they have tried to get into this country, and these friends have been, as many millions have been, members of totalitarian states, and to save their own skins they have given lip service to these totalitarian states, and by this act—I think it is section 212 and other portions of the act—these people

have been discriminated against and cannot come to this country, although they would make fine citizens. One was a doctor and his wife. This doctor was married to a doctor, and they finally settled in Canada because they could not get into this country, and these young people were trying to get them into one of the communities of this country where they needed a doctor and needed a doctor very badly. But the spirit of this act and the whole tone of it has made that impossible.

Then they had a young couple, friends of theirs, and he was an American and the wife was of European extraction, and she couldn't get here because of her membership. Now, when in the church we deal with repentance, and we do know that a repentant sinner is sometimes a more firm believer in the thing that they repent to, and they are more against the thing they repent from, and I believe that Europe is filled with people who may have been members of some totalitarian party and they are repentant and therefore probably would be more strong-feeling against totalitarianism than some others who may not have been members of some party or some group.

Now I certainly am strongly opposed to all forms of totalitarianism. I believe that all religious groups, that all Christian groups and Jewish groups are set against this form of government. However, I do believe that where we have repentant people we ought to give them a chance to come into our fold and become citizens of the United States.

I have letters from Governor Anderson and Senator Thye and others who in the same spirit as the gentleman who preceded me passed it because they had to have a bill and this was the best they had to offer, and although they intimated they weren't too keen about it it went through anyway; and I believe that there are many of our Congressmen who in the last rush of the last days did not have an opportunity to read this and digest it and understand it, and therefore I believe it should be revised and brought into keeping with our own Christian and democratic principles. That I think is the extent of my testimony here this morning.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Do we correctly understand you as being in favor of the admission of immigrants on a completely equal basis, for people of Asia, Indonesia, Japan, South Africa, et cetera, as well as Europe?

Reverend CAMPBELL. That is right. I feel very strongly about this thing. I have in my own background my mother who was a Norwegian immigrant who came from Norway, and my father's people were Irish immigrants and there is a strange mixture and there is a conflict within me, you might say. So that we have the preferred group within my family but I lived in a community where they were not preferred people, a steel community which had 27 nationalities from Europe and I failed to find there was any difference in the things these people from Europe had to offer. One family, where a man still can't talk the language well enough to understand him unless you know him a while, has four boys who are doctors and they are from the group that we would more or less discriminate against, and I just don't feel that there is any reason for that at all. And I know that that is true because I worked in that kind of a community.

(A statement submitted at a later date by Frank W. Schultz, president, local No. 9, United Packinghouse Workers of America, follows:)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY FRANK W. SCHULTZ, PRESIDENT, LOCAL NO. 9, UNITED
PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS OF AMERICA

LOCAL NO. 9, UNITED PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Austin, Minn., October 4, 1952.

HARRY N. ROSENFIELD,

*Executive Director, President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
Executive Office,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to express my views in respect to the McCarran-Walter immigration law which will be the subject of a series of hearings by your Commission in a number of cities around the country.

It appears to me the newly enacted immigration law is so beset with racial supremacy as to make it appear arrogant and offensive to serious-thinking Americans and to those in other parts of the world that look to our Nation for guidance and leadership.

In theory it is true that the bill purports to eliminate racial discrimination in our immigration system, but it is well recognized that, for all practical purposes, this theory is not going to develop into a reality. The vague standards established in the new law for admission of aliens appear to be an unreasonable and unrealistic system for deporting those whom some Government official may have reason to believe should be deported.

That aspect of the law appears to be in contradiction to our American procedures that have in the past been based on justice, equity, and fair play.

The bill, in my judgment, does not eliminate racial discrimination in our immigration laws, but only continues it in a new form. It takes away from the Attorney General much of his authority to suspend deportation of worthy and desirable aliens already in this country. It also discriminates on the basis of sex and skills. This aspect of the law is most difficult to comprehend in light of the fact that it is this very group that has helped make our country into one of the greatest nations on the face of the earth. From my vantage point, it would appear that the new immigration law would be a liability rather than an asset to our foreign policy leadership during these troubled times.

All in all it appears to me that the new immigration law was written out of fear much rather than confidence in our ability to accept, rehabilitate, and assimilate portions of the down-trodden and oppressed peoples of the world who desire to come to America and establish a new way of life.

It is my sincere judgment that many of us here today making our contributions to society would not be in this country had the present law been in effect and enforced literally when our parents came to America.

No one will deny that we need necessary safeguards in regard to the immigration situation, but those safeguards ought to be based on what is humane, just, and liberal. Those are the things we tell the world we stand for. Our actions in respect to these things are the measuring sticks that the people in all parts of the world use when judging us.

Aside from that the very fabric of our democratic conscience has always dictated humane and liberal policies.

In conclusion, it is my humble opinion that those same policies should prevail in respect to our immigration laws.

Thanking you considerably for any attention you might show my few remarks, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

FRANK W. SCHULTZ,
President, Local No. 9, UPWA-CIO.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Rev. Caspar B. Nervig here?

STATEMENT OF REV. CASPAR B. NERVIG, PASTOR OF THE FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH OF WILLISTON, N. DAK.

Reverend NERVIG. I am Rev. Caspar B. Nervig, 8038 Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak. I am pastor of the First Lutheran Church of Williston, a congregation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

I happen to be a member of the North Dakota Rural Life Commission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and am here because of the interest shown in rural life, and certain contacts with irrigation and agricultural developments on the Great Plains. I do not come officially representing anyone as such: however, I am here at the request of the representatives of the National Lutheran Council who thought in view of my contacts in the Great Plains area, and some work that I had done in the placing of displaced persons in our city and community, that I might have some observations to carry here, and so I speak very largely on my own, of course, and I come with no prepared statement.

But I do have some thoughts on this subject that I would like to share with you, and I am not going to go into the technical details of the law because I do feel rather incompetent. I want to say right at the outset these 2 hours here today have added to the impression that I had before, that this is a very difficult problem, and I appreciate the position that our Congress was in, and the position that your Commission is in, that you probably are faced with a conflict that is not perfectly soluble.

On the one hand, we have the question of what we think we ought to do, and what we would like to do, and what we can do, and it is quite possible for us to be carried away, either by idealism or by the other extreme, entirely, utilitarianism, and I believe that there will have to be a solution that takes into account the broad picture, and of course that's your responsibility and not mine.

I feel, first of all, on the question of immigration that we have to make at the present moment a distinction between a temporary program and a permanent program, and, of course, the McCarran Act, as I understand it, is the permanent program; but I also understand that in your discussions you are considering the immediate temporary needs as well, and I would like to point up that distinction: that when we come to the discussion of the displaced persons, and that whole group of people in which there is now an emergency situation, we are dealing with a group of people that are not typical immigrants. I can on this point quote the janitor of my church, who is a Latvian, formerly president of a state teachers college in Latvia, and inspector in the department of education for the whole of Latvia, the author of many textbooks, now keeping my church clean. One of the high points in my own contact with these Latvians was the day that I visited him early in my contact with him in the little basement apartment we had for him, and he took off from the bookshelf a few books and handed them to me, and I couldn't read them for I don't know a word of Latvian, but on the title page I could read "Martin's Guide." One after another he handed me the books of which he had been an author, and with a gesture sort of like despair he tossed them on the bed, and in that gesture of despair I saw the man tossing aside his life. He is making a marvelous adjustment and at the same time typifies a unique problem. He says to me: "We aren't immigrants: we did not leave our country because of choice. We left it because we had to, and therefore I appreciate very much what your country has already done."

I appreciate very much, too, what our country has already done, and I feel that we should try to do more, and I believe that there are

two reasons for this: the first one is the humanitarian aspect, the Christian aspect that has been emphasized so well already today, and on this point I may be not fully qualified to have an opinion on it, but I have felt that perhaps we ought to do something that is more clearly charity, I believe that in the selecting process of the DP's we have been looking not only to the welfare of the DP's but to the welfare of America in that we have been trying to skim the cream, leaving for someone else to take care of that which is, shall I say, the milk, or even the buttermilk.

I wonder if we couldn't, as a nation, make room for some of these folks that somebody will have to take care of. I refer to the sick, even the TB. I don't know why we should leave it to a country like Sweden to provide room for a few TB folks and for a country like Norway to take a handful of the blind. I wonder if we couldn't do it too?

I realize that there are problems involved, but even if it did cost us as a nation some money it would be an act almost pure and simple of charity, while mixed with the other have been motives of self-interest.

For instance, now, I have amongst my DP's in Williston a couple who are middle-aged with two fine young people, but the grandmother is still in Germany waiting for what? To die? Nothing else. Couldn't we take her in—even if there was a possibility of her some day needing some old-age assistance? That's the pure humanitarian aspect that I would like to stress.

In skimming the cream of the healthy and the strong and the skilled, we are leaving the others to someone else. But the question is, Do we have a responsibility? I feel that we do, and I would like to especially stress that I feel that we have a responsibility to many of the displaced Germans, morally as a nation, I believe that we became party to a certain race ideology that we never intended to, and never realized when we underwrote as a nation the removal of 10 million people from eastern Germany where their ancestors had lived for a thousand years or more, and in that way we became a party, unintentionally, to the uprooting of people, purely because of race.

Now that's another aspect of the race issue that was raised today that is a little more remote from us and for that reason we don't see it. But I believe it has its place in the consideration of temporary legislation for that type of people.

Now when I go over to the permanent program of immigration, I feel that I don't want to say too much about the McCarran-Walter Act because, as I said before, I am not too competent, so I would like to speak in general terms on it.

In the first place, I believe that in the permanent program of immigration, we want to recognize the value of immigration as more or less an on-going part of American life; maybe it is true that even as a city benefits from the constant sociological influx of rural people, so America as a nation will benefit through the years by the constant influx of new blood.

In the first place, it is our tradition. We have been the melting pot and proud of it. In the second place, it is an essential part of our American ideals as has been brought our several times today, and has been written at the base of the Statue of Liberty also: more-

over, I believe it is good for our respective communities when we get some new blood willing to put in a full day's work, and a full hour's labor for an hour's pay. It puts to shame some folks whose attitude is to get as much as possible for as little as possible. And maybe there is a good moral benefit coming to our communities by the influx of many of this type of people. But now I come over to the side which is realistic, and here you will, maybe, say I am on the verge of contradicting myself, but here is where we must temper our idealism with realism.

Everyone today, I believe, has granted the necessity of some type of limitation and regulation, and I don't believe that any one has urged the individual open-throwing of our doors. But we have had a good deal of objection to the quota system, and there has been only one suggestion brought out, and that's the suggestion of one overall quota to be determined by a central commission, I suppose, or bureau; now if there is going to be any limitation at all, you are going to have selection and discrimination anyhow. If there are 500,000 people that want to come into the United States in a given year, and the law limits them to 150,000, someone is going to have to select and choose. The only difference is that the selection is made by bureaus, and not by law.

Now, even within the framework of quotas, selection is made by bureau and persons, but in the over-all picture the guidance that they have is by law, and I think I would rather entrust to an act of Congress, a basis of selection, as long as there must be selection, rather than leave it to a bureau where there is a much greater opportunity for personal prejudice and group pressure and that type of thing.

We are in a situation where we have to make a selection, and until someone comes with some other way of making a selection than the basic principle, I don't know why we can object to it. I realize there must be some weak points in it that have been brought out today, but fundamentally we will have to have something like it or else something that nobody has thought of yet, at least I haven't heard about it.

Now when it comes to the race problem, I think that we mustn't channel all our thinking about racial rights into the lone channel of immigration. I think that there are many other aspects of the equality of rights of nations that plays into our American picture in addition to the immigration one, and if this was the only point on which we ought to take this into consideration, then, it would be maybe a greater issue than it really is.

Now, I agree with the attitudes of many of my colleagues in the clergy that have spoken here in the equality of races, and I think that there is much that we need to do in America for human liberties along that line; and, yet, I believe that from a realistic point of view there is a limit to our thinking here too.

Now, if a man from China moved to Williston who wanted to join my church, I would be glad to have him, I would like to have him as a deacon in my congregation, but frankly I don't want his son to marry my daughter. Now, is that racism? I don't think so. You know, in our farming territory out here in the Middle West, we are awfully fussy about pure-blood stock. It isn't so much a question of whether a Hereford is better than a Holstein, but one is good for milk and the other is good for beef, and a pure blood of either is better than a scrub

of both. So in our enthusiasm for racial justice, I think we must temper it by other considerations.

I believe that the various races, the orientals, are better people as orientals, with pride in their own race. So, therefore, alongside of our immigration approach to the question of race, it seems to me that there is another approach: in the past, while international economic world leadership centered in Europe, and America was a wide-open country with vast areas, we were the refuge of the oppressed, the poor, and the like. But, now, America holds the upper hand in world economy, and it seems to me that a part of this brotherhood of races could be expressed by America in a desire for us to lift the other nations and races where they are.

For instance, I read an article in a magazine the other day in which the author was deplored very much that German industry had now recovered to the extent that a certain steel company had successfully underbid an American steel company in selling a bridge in South America, and this was terrible. Well, I was glad and I think we all should be glad if we don't want to be forever handing out a dollar in Europe, we should be glad that a European nation is getting to the stage where it can support itself and support its own people again. And, therefore, I think this matter of racial equality and justice and human rights takes on an aspect in our national policy that is beyond the function of this committee, and beyond the question of immigration. But I believe there is a way in which we as an American nation can tell these other nations and races of the world, we love you as brothers, and think you have got as much right as we have.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. May I ask a question: How would you go about it to settle 10 impecunious farm families in Williams County wheat farming areas?

Reverend NERVIG. Quite impossible.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Why?

Reverend NERVIG. Well, in the first place you couldn't buy the land if you wanted to; after all, there is some oil business going on around there. You couldn't pay for a farm with almost any kind of money out there today, and if you could pay for the farm to start farming in Williams County, it would take at least \$20,000 worth of equipment. It takes a young capitalist to be a farmer in the Great Plains today.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. May I ask a couple more questions: Now in terms of happy farm life, we usually think of cows and chickens and sheep; how many cows are on your typical wheat farm?

Reverend NERVIG. Practically none. They drink Minnesota milk, some of them. Milk is shipped from places in Minnesota to Williston and we in Williston have often drunk Minnesota milk.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. What would happen to a farm family settled not only in an oil territory but throughout those territories during the winter months, what would they do for a living?

Reverend NERVIG. Well, in the wheat-farming territory where it is a seasonable operation, there is nothing for them to do, and men aren't interested in hiring year-round people, or only a few. I don't want to give a false impression; there is some dairying there, too; for instance, I had a farmer who is a dairyman that wanted to get a DP as a hired man.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. A single man or a family man?

Reverend NERVIG. He was ready to take a family, but he was quite an exceptional case. It is very difficult because most of these farmers fold up. Because one of the problems of the Great Plains and folks interested in the family farm will agree with me on this, is that one of the problems in this Great Plains area is the tendency to become suitcase farmers as they now of late have been calling them.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. You have some in that community who fly airplanes to their farms?

Reverend NERVIG. I have two that fly back and forth every day 30 miles to Williston, every day, jump on their \$5,000 combine and \$5,000 tractor and run it all day, sweep down a big acreage, and fly back home in the evening.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. What is the average acreage of a farm in the irrigation project that has been developed in the Missouri River Valley, if you are familiar with it?

Reverend NERVIG. The average acreage is 80 for an irrigated farm, the average for a family-size farm considered in our territory now is about a section and a half for the wheat farm; but the irrigation farm they consider that a family-sized unit is about 80 to 100 acres.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Just for the record, for those that don't come from North Dakota, will you indicate what a section and a half means in acreage?

Reverend NERVIG. One section is 640 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they raise on an 80-acre farm?

Reverend NERVIG. That gets to be a different type of farm. There is developing better industry and a good deal of alfalfa, and there also is the continuation of wheat farming even on irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. Can they raise much on 80 acres?

Reverend NERVIG. Oh yes; you can raise double as much wheat on irrigation than you can on dry land, if it is handled right. It depends on the Lord, of course.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Who has the priority for these 80-acre farms?

Reverend NERVIG. Of course, we don't have very many of them yet. Those two irrigation programs or projects we have on the bottomland of the Missouri are almost only experiments, you might say; but the policy in force there now is that the first choice for the purchase of the lands is to a veteran who is a citizen of North Dakota.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. What opportunities, then, would there be for an immigrant to be settled in that area?

Reverend NERVIG. I am sure that there is no hope for immigration settlement there in that way at all the present time, unless there is some vast change in the future.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. The Commission has been furnished current information concerning the farm labor situation in certain States, and for North Dakota, for instance, we have been told that there is a shortage of help for general farm hands, and that husky men are necessary for loading and there is this indication that Mexican labor or nationals are employed in South Dakota, for example, as foreign agricultural workers, transported to the United States, under a program which the Employment Service is operating. Would you care

to enlighten the Commission on the significance of any of this need for more people and the use of foreign nationals in these labor areas?

Reverend NERVIG. That importation of labor doesn't apply in western North Dakota, it applies in the Red River Valley where there is a good deal of beet farming and also potato farming, particularly the beet farming; and that, of course, is something that is entirely different from immigration because that is seasonal labor, it comes up in the spring and they camp in some shacks and live under trucks, and in tents and what have you, very inadequate facilities and the farmer only has to have a shed he can fix up for a camp and they camp there until harvest, and then go back to Mexico. I don't know of immigrant labor that becomes permanent residents, if that could take care of them. They would have to be paid a year-round living wage somehow.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. And about the information made available to us of a shortage for help in general farm hands in North Dakota, what about that; does that conform with your knowledge of the situation?

Reverend NERVIG. I don't think that there is such an overwhelming demand. What they usually do is buy more machinery, it is such a terrific mechanization. I don't know, I have qualms about this increased mechanization; I wish we could stay back to where the human being was more important than the machine. All along the line I think that is a basis concept. But at the same time, realistically facing the situation there is a tendency for the farmer to buy bigger machinery.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Let me put it in generalized terms: do you know from your experience in these areas in general of any continuing, of any temporary, of any partial demand for labor which is not supplied, and which is not met in the farm communities of the Plain States?

Reverend NERVIG. I don't think there is any cry for labor. I think in my observation of a few cases that I know, where a man was looking for laborers, but not any crying need.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Wasn't it out of the Great Plain States that the general demand came for exemptions from the selective service for the farm youth on the ground that special attention was necessary there, else the farms would be seriously handicapped or hampered in meeting the farm production goals?

Reverend NERVIG. I think that was true, and there it would be draining off farm labor that already was there; and of course I remember at the time that there were many farmers that said his own son was worth two hired men.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Does that situation no longer prevail?

Reverend NERVIG. No; I think that would still be true. I don't think there is any surplus of farm labor, and I think from situation to situation there is a need, but I don't think we should be misled by an overwhelming need. I might base that observation partly on DP's whom we were resettling. I had a hard time in finding farmers interested in taking on DP hired men. That is partly in the background of my thinking. It wasn't easy to find farmers that were interested in taking on or needed that type of help. That was the problem. For a single man dropping in for the season, why there was a lot of seasonal work needed but very little of that year-round work.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. How many did you resettle in the State of North Dakota, do you know?

Reverend NERVIG. Practically 600 DP's and ethnic Germans were resettled by the Lutheran Resettlement Committee, I am informed.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it be known that we have invited to testify in St. Paul a great many more people than have accepted our invitation. For instance, we don't have on the schedule as many farm representatives as we hoped to have appear. I would like to request that there be inserted in the record a full list of those who were invited, but did not accept.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done. The hearing will now recess until 1:30 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m. the Commission recessed until 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)



HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1952

SIXTEENTH SESSION

ST. PAUL, MINN.

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization met at 1:30 p. m., pursuant to recess, in the auditorium, State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn., Hon. Philip B. Perlman, Chairman, presiding.

Present: Chairman Philip B. Perlman, and the following Commissioners: Msgr. John O'Grady, Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, Mr. Thomas G. Finucane.

Also present: Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director.

PERSONS INVITED TO THE ST. PAUL HEARINGS IN ADDITION TO THOSE WHO TESTIFIED OR SUBMITTED STATEMENTS

(The list referred to on p. 883, follows:)

Baird, Julian, president, First National Bank, St. Paul, Minn.
Berger, Rev. Leo J., Sibley, Iowa.
Blegen, Theodore C., dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Boxrud, Rev. David, Lutheran Memorial Church, Pierre, S. Dak.
Butler, Pierce, attorney, St. Paul, Minn.
Carlson, Dr. Edgar M., care Gustavas Adolphos College, St. Peter, Minn.
Chapin, Prof. Stuart, chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Christianson, Edwin, president, Minnesota Farmers Union, 2470 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.
Christianson, Otto, executive vice president, Minnesota Employers Association, Pioneer Building, St. Paul, Minn.
Curtin, Rev. Francis J., Minnesota Catholic Welfare Association, 226 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.
Davis, Prof. Kenneth, Minneapolis Law School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Diracles, John M., president, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Metropolitan Life Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
Ettel, Michael, president, Catholic Aid Association of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
Finke, Walter, Minneapolis Honeywell, 2753 Fourth Avenue, South, Minneapolis, Minn.
Gjenvick, Rev. Benjamin A., Lutheran Resettlement Service, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Glabe, Rev. E. B., 3606 Edmund Boulevard, Minneapolis 6, Minn.
Graening, Carl, State adjutant, American Legion.
Green, Lloyd M., State Federation of Labor, 418 Auditorium Street, St. Paul, Minn.
Hluncke, Mrs. Mary, chairman, Displaced Persons Committee, State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

Jones, J. S., Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, 478 St. Peter, St. Paul, Minn.
Lawson, George W., secretary, Minnesota State Federation of Labor, 416 Auditorium Street, St. Paul, Minn.
Levy, Mrs. Irving, 609 Mount Calm, St. Paul, Minn.
Mayo, William, regional director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, 150 West Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
Miller, Paul, director of extension, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
Mintener, Bradshaw, vice president, Pillsbury Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.
Moscrip, W. S., St. Paul Association of Commerce, 1543 Grantham, St. Paul, Minn.
Nelson, Dr. Lowry, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
Olson, R. A., president, Minnesota State Federation of Labor, 416 Auditorium Street, St. Paul, Minn.
Pearson, William B., Minnesota State Grange, Oglivie, Minn.
Rein, Clayton, St. Paul Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1009 Fairmont Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.
Robinson, Paul T., manager, American Crystal Sugar Co., Chaska, Minn.
Siebenand, A. W., employee relations manager, Green Giant Canning Co., LeSuer, Minn.
Sjelstad, Palmer, 500 North Highland, Pierre, S. Dak.
Steefel, Mrs. Genevieve, Unitarian Service Committee, Minneapolis, Minn.
Strenglis, Harry, president, St. Paul Chapter AHEPA, St. Paul, Minn.
Straight, Rev. Hayden, Minnesota Council of Churches, 122 West Franklin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.
Thompson, Cameron, North West Bank Corp., North West Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
Tregila, Miss Mary, Sioux City, Iowa.
Upgren, Arthur, economist, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.
Van Zinderen, John, Dutch Club, St. Paul, Minn.
Vasey, Wayne, director, School of Social Work, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Whiting, Rev. Henry J., Lutheran Welfare Society, 2110 First Avenue, South, Minneapolis 4, Minn.
Wilson, Rev. John, secretary, Minnesota Council of Churches, Minneapolis, Minn.
Winton, David, Winton Lumber Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
Wyman, Mrs., president, Minneapolis Council on Americanization, 418 Metropolitan Life Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will be in order.

Mr. Paul G. Eidbo will be our first witness this afternoon.

STATEMENT OF PAUL G. EIDBO, REPRESENTING LUTHERAN RESETTLEMENT SERVICE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. EIDBO. I am Paul G. Eidbo, and I am representing the Lutheran Resettlement Service of North Dakota, with headquarters in Fargo, N. Dak. That organization is an agency of the National Lutheran Council.

I would like to comment on the DP program of the past and of emergency legislation for the future. First of all, I would like to say that the DP program we have had in North Dakota has been very successful.

It has been my responsibility in North Dakota to effect the resettlement of these DP's who are brought in by the Lutheran Church. We have placed displaced persons and ethnic Germans in every type of job in North Dakota. I would like to point out, for instance, that North Dakota has gained seven very good medical doctors through the DP program. These doctors have filled in, in communities where before now it has been impossible to get medical services. The North

Dakota Veterinarian Board has hired and brought in several DP veterinarians, all of them doing very well.

Among other vocations or professions represented are instructors. We have college instructors working in their professions in North Dakota and bookkeepers and office managers, and nearly anything you can name.

The CHAIRMAN. How many came to North Dakota, do you know?

Mr. EIDBO. All told, I wouldn't be able to say. I believe it is less than 1,500 but over 1,000 when you consider the Catholic Welfare Association and the Lutheran Church World Service.

I wanted to point out, too, as Reverend Nervig said before, that the United States as a nation has the responsibility toward the refugees now in Germany. I don't know how many know that the Government of the United States agreed with communistic Russia to allow for the expulsion of the ethnic German people from their homelands. Had these people been allowed to remain where they were you would have at least 10 million less people in Western Germany. Therefore I think that, although the United States probably unknowingly agreed to this eviction of all these people from their homelands, they did so nevertheless and should help to take care of them. Not only should we skim the cream, as Reverend Nervig pointed out, but we should help the "hard core."

The entire population of Latvia and Estonia that has escaped communism has been drained of all professional and educated people and are left now with many old people, crippled people or those that fall into the classification of "hard core" cases.

In North Dakota we brought in six "hard core" cases with the understanding they would be dependent upon someone else. In our case in North Dakota all six cases are now self-supporting and the outlook is that they will remain that way. The cost of bringing in more "hard core" cases should be borne, I believe, by the country and not by any church group. If you consider the total cost of the DP Commission's activities, I believe the report states that there were \$19 million spent and the income that these refugees have contributed to our country has exceeded \$57 million. That is in a very short time. Over a long period of time the people would contribute much more than that. So, looking at it as far as an investment, I must agree with the DP story that it is a good investment.

In North Dakota there was considerable talk about the opportunities for workers in our State. I believe someone mentioned the fact that there are not enough farm laborers. Right now in North Dakota the agricultural season is largely at an end. However, you still have many farm opportunities given because if they can get a farm helper at this time they are willing to pay him all through the winter for doing very little in order to have him during the summer months when they can use him.

I wanted to mention that in North Dakota the farm buildings that are lived in in many instances are surrounded by vacant farm dwellings. I have seen many cases where we have put DP's in these vacant dwellings and they have worked for the farmers as farm laborers,

and they have worked out satisfactorily. One of the big problems to the farmers in North Dakota is that many of them do not have extra housing. I think if you look at the total picture, however, you will find plenty of vacant housing on the farms and near enough to the work.

Left in North Dakota are about 300 of the DP's that the Lutheran Church brought in. Most of them have left for the larger cities. Many of them came here to Minneapolis and went to Chicago and New York, the reason being that they have—I can say—been exploited by the sponsors who brought them into the State. There has been considerable criticism of the resettlement program or of the DP's or the ethnic Germans because they failed where they received their assurances, but I think if you will investigate any of the cases the reason you will find them leaving is that they have been offered jobs that far surpass the ones they have. Living conditions offered are much better. And after all, if we consider the original idea behind the resettlement idea, which was to help these people to become resettled and useful people and self-supporting, then I think you must agree that the past resettlement program has been very successful.

I am advocating that we have emergency legislation again at this time which will allow us to bring over the pipeline cases or the cases that were in the pipeline and had to be canceled, in addition to others of these refugees over there.

As far as the McCarran-Walter bill is concerned, I don't know too much about it. But I think it is my opinion that the statement presented on behalf of the Minnesota Lutheran Welfare Society can be endorsed by North Dakota also.

I have nothing further to say.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. I wonder, Mr. Eidbo, would you care to venture an estimate of the number of persons of German ethnic origin who could reasonably well be settled on the farms of North Dakota if such an emergency program as you propose were to be enacted?

Mr. EIDBO. I could no more than make a very rough guess, but I would say easily, if the families brought over were screened and were farmers as they say they are, that it would be a small job to find places for 100 families. Over a little longer period of time you could work that into more families. Our big trouble has been misrepresentation. We get farmers who are not farmers. Too, I have always known that a farmer from Europe can't come out here and run our mechanized machinery, and I have always pointed that out to the sponsors. But in so many cases they haven't even been European farmers. They have been something entirely different.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. And is there a need for these 100 farm families or is that something that would be created out of humanitarian reasons?

Mr. EIDBO. No; I believe that exists as a lack.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Manpower shortage?

Mr. EIDBO. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You talk about these vacant houses. Why did they become vacant?

Mr. EIDBO. Well, the first answer might be because of machinery, but I have just talked to several farmers who have purchased all this expensive machinery because they can't get farm help. So, in order to maintain this machinery they have to farm a bigger area.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the farms themselves have become much larger than they once were?

Mr. EIDBO. That is right, in order to pay for that machinery.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that situation liable to continue?

Mr. EIDBO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. If that situation continues to develop will there be less room for individual farmers?

Mr. EIDBO. Well, I think there is a limit to the point that you can increase the size of a farm. A lot of trouble is that farmers can't keep their sons at home. It sounds like an age-old charge, but I run into that quite often. A farmer will be condemning a DP for not staying on the farm and then I ask him where his son is and he replies, "Well, he went to town." It is getting so that some day these people are going to pass their farms on to somebody else and they will be split up. There are some splittings going on all the time, and I believe the increase in the size of farms has slowed down considerably since the war or in the last 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think they are being broken up into smaller units again?

Mr. EIDBO. Somewhat. They are probably pretty stable in that respect, but at least they aren't increasing in size too much.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Do you have any estimate of the average age of the North Dakota farmer?

Mr. EIDBO. No; I wouldn't.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Some people have told us that it is rather a high average.

Mr. EIDBO. They are not young people any more. I couldn't give you any—

Commissioner FINUCANE. I understand from what you said that when the farm help leaves the farm then the farmer, to take care of the situation, gets more machinery?

Mr. EIDBO. Yes.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Does that completely alleviate the need for farm help or is it a poor substitute or partial substitute?

Mr. EIDBO. Well, it is a partial substitute, I would say. I wouldn't say it is complete.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Not complete?

Mr. EIDBO. No. In the potato valley right now you are having the introduction of a new machine and there is quite a bit of pro and con in the local papers on the advantages of the machinery over the hired hand. The farmer can pick up so many more potatoes, it is true, but still you have just as many farmers who say they would rather employ the people than use the machinery.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Chester A. Graham here?

STATEMENT OF CHESTER A. GRAHAM, REPRESENTING THE NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION AND THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. GRAHAM. I am Chester A. Graham, director of radio for the North Dakota Farmers Union. I am here to represent the National Farmers Union and the North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, N. Dak.

I have a statement I should like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, my name is Chester A. Graham. I represent the National Farmers Union and the North Dakota Farmers Union, slightly over 40,000 families, and would like to address our thinking to all three of the points raised in section 2 of the Executive order creating the work of this Commission. A large number of the farm families which have been members of our organization down through the years have been foreign born, or the sons and daughters of immigrants. When I returned from overseas service in June 1919 at the close of World War I, I served for a period of 2 years as service secretary to the foreign-born people of Akron, Ohio, for the Young Men's Christian Association. Following that service, I served for 5 years as director of Americanization for the public schools of Akron, Ohio, in which capacity I dealt directly with some 43 nationality groups of immigrants in that great industrial city. It was during that time that the Immigration Act of 1924 was passed. I took an active part in the discussion of that legislation throughout the State of Ohio, and since that time have maintained a close interest in our immigration and naturalization policies. My testimony today represents not only the position of the organization which I represent, but also deep personal convictions which have grown out of experience in work with immigrant people in the United States.

Farmers Union thinking about the admission and assimilation of immigrant people in the United States is predicated upon a firm conviction that as a nation we must build bravely toward a greater and greater fulfillment of an economy of abundance, and we dare not try to go back to an old economy of scarcity with its corollary of fears about not being able to have room for modern Pilgrims who come to our shores from other parts of the world. Farmers Union members believe that we should not only retain the Emma Lazarus inscription at the base of the Statue of Liberty but that we should continue to implement the sentiment of that inscription in our personal attitudes and in our legislative policies regarding immigration and naturalization. We believe that due care should be taken in legislation to exclude all those who come to this country under explicit design to harm our Government and our social structure, but we want our Federal legislation on immigration and naturalization to be framed with the basic intention to bring worthy immigrants to this country. Our basic criticism of Public Law 414 passed by the Congress of the United States on June 27, 1952, is that more emphasis is given to excluding people from this country than to including them. Careful reading of the act gives us the impression that more attention is given to keeping prospective immigrants away from this country, than is given to making this country a haven and a home for oppressed and downtrodden people who have a vision of making a better world for their families and their posterity.

Prospective immigrants should be judged by their overt acts rather than by ideas that they are alleged to have. People who have been under-nourished and hungry for a period of years do not think the same way that we, who have had plenty to eat, think. And I would like to add there that one of my sons was a member of the famous

starvation project that was conducted here at the University of Minnesota. My son is normally a cooperative-minded person, and he told me that as he got deeper and deeper into that experience of starvation it became more and more repulsive to think about cooperating with any others.

I think sometimes we don't quite understand what happens to the thinking of people when they experience even semistarvation.

My own experience has taught me that those who become harmful members of our society come more from those having considerable education than from those who had little opportunity for education. Wise immigration legislation will not make lack of opportunity for formal education a handicap for those seeking admission to the United States.

Ample opportunity should be given to prospective immigrants for appeal to impartial appeal boards when their application for visa or for admission is denied. Aliens threatened with deportation should have the same protection. Public Law 414 does not provide this protection, and it gives entirely too much arbitrary power to consular officers in foreign countries and to immigration and naturalization officers in this country.

There has been a custom, all too common, in our American cities to compel foreign-born families to live in socially-neglected sections of our cities. This has resulted in a tendency toward crime and delinquency in the children of these families in many instances. This tendency was the result of the urban community environment, and not due to the fact that the children had parents who were foreign-born. This error in thinking has led to an assumption that immigrant people are potential sources of social, economic, and political trouble. Wise legislation on immigration and naturalization should not be based on this false assumption.

Home and family life are basic to a wholesome society. All immigration legislation should be designed to facilitate the unity of families (father, mother, and children at least under 15 years of age) who want to come to the United States. All provisions for quotas should be flexible at this point, and some flexibility should be provided in the cases of curable diseases among children. It is mandatory that all discrimination as to race, religion, and economic status shall be eliminated from legislation.

Fears about immigrants interfering with job security and wage rates in industry are not grounded in fact. Labor organizations in some instances have opposed liberal immigration laws because they considered the influx of newcomers would lower standards of wages and working conditions. As a matter of fact foreign-born workers have been faithful members of labor organizations.

Those groups in industry which have been willing to pull down the wages and working conditions have come from underdeveloped areas in our own country, not from the foreign born. Public Law 414 gives the Secretary of Labor power to stop immigration when he decides that there are enough industrial workers in this country to fill all available jobs. Such power needs to be carefully curbed, because the advent of immigrant families also creates demands for goods and services, and creates new jobs.

Throughout our history additions to our population by means of immigration have produced new jobs, new consumers, and new forms of industrial expansion. The fault has been more often in us and in our attitudes toward our immigrant people than it has been in them. Just as the State Department and the Labor Department are integrated into the total program in Public Law 414, so also the Office of Education should be a part of the total program. People who are to become citizens of our Government and neighbors in our communities need an understanding welcome and introduction to the new environment into which they come. Lectures about this being the greatest country in the world are not much help to an immigrant mother who is put on a train at Hoboken with three small children with all the necessary baggage for her baby stowed away in the baggage car and no introduction to the sanitary provisions on the train, and no knowledge of the friendly services that might be available to her on a 14-day trip across the United States in an immigrant train, and I am referring to an incident I experienced myself.

Private service agencies have done a valiant service to our immigrant families coming to this country, but that service should be a part of the friendly welcome of new pilgrims provided in the immigration and naturalization legislation.

We further take the position that the mass migrations to the United States which we experienced in the first two decades of this century are a thing of the past. Even without any numerical restrictions we would not experience such extensive influx into this country in the foreseeable future. With immigration, or without immigration, our population growth in this country will soon take us through a basic change from a nation of exportable food surpluses to a nation gearing its agricultural program and policy to production of abundance. Wasteful methods of soil erosion and soil depletion, destruction of our timber resources and our forest potentials, waste of other natural resources, and uncontrolled rivers rushing madly to the sea carrying destruction in their wake practically every season, will have to give way to a more constructive planning, development, and use of our potential capacity to produce food and fiber. Our organization takes the position that we can develop out of our existing potentials, the capacity to produce food and fiber not only for our own growing population but also for pilgrims who want to come to our shores to help make here a home for people.

The whole system of deportations, provided for at such great length in Public Law 414, as a method of dealing with persons who have been duly admitted to the United States, is not sound either domestically or in relation to the building of the kind of world order that we want today. The devastating fears that haunt the lives of native-born citizens are minor compared with the fears of a foreign-born citizen who can so easily become the brunt of prejudice and hysteria. Now we have added to that the fear of deportation under our immigration law. Social workers know all too well the social problems created for a family whose breadwinner has been deported. Undoubtedly, there are individual cases where deportation is the best possible alternative, but provisions for deportation of aliens should be very limited in our immigration policy and practice. Certainly no alien should be deported without a fair and open hearing on the charges claimed as

grounds for deportation. To make a foreign-born person subject to deportation because of having had a nervous breakdown, or for having gone on relief during economic stress, would be a violation of our sense of fair play and would create ill feeling in other parts of the world toward the United States. Even eagerness to come to the United States to the extent of entering without full compliance with the law should not be ipso facto grounds for deportation.

The theory that certain portions of the human race are superior to other portions of the race, which we now call racism, is a blight upon modern civilization. It is the heart of the quota system in the Immigration Act of 1924 and the national-origins system embodied in later amendments to that law. The same fundamental error is continued in Public Law 414. The established total of 154,000 immigrants theoretically provided in the law has never been filled because major quotas are assigned to countries which never fill their quotas—not a sufficient number of persons in those countries want to leave home and migrate to the United States. The quota system has been, and is, an insult to the peoples of the countries barred by extremely small quotas.

The oriental-exclusion clauses of the Immigration Act of 1924 was one of a number of regrettable international incidents that finally had their climax in Pearl Harbor. And I might just stop on that and add that when news came to us in 1925, sitting in my home in Akron I suggested to my wife, "Here is the beginning of our entrance into World War II." I think it was one of the regrettable incidents that helped to create the bitter feeling, particularly on the part of the Japanese. We can be thankful perhaps for the token progress made in the present legislation which makes Asian people eligible for admission and for citizenship, but the maximum quota of 100 for a country like India is an insult to the people of India, and is a part of an insult to all Asian peoples.

If a quota system is deemed necessary by Congress as a means to stabilize or control the volume of immigration in any one year, then the unused quotas from one country should be readily transferrable to other countries upon the basis of the sincere desire of prospective immigrants to come to the United States, and not upon any discriminatory assumption that people from southern Europe are inferior to people from northern Europe or that people from Asia are inferior to people from other parts of the world. Our organization believes that this Nation could readily welcome and assimilate more than 154,000 immigrants each year, but if that figure is set as the maximum, then the quota system should not be used to keep the total below that number.

The undesirability of the national quotas was discovered in the admission of displaced persons in recent years. To meet the situation half of the annual quota for each of these years was mortgaged for future years. It is my understanding that half of the quotas for Latvia are mortgaged up to the year 2274, and for other countries nearly as long. We believe that all the quota mortgages should be completely wiped off the books in new immigration legislation. The Farmers Union heartily endorses the legislation on immigration and naturalization which was introduced in the United States Senate by Senators Lehman, Humphrey, Morse, and other Senators. We

want the United States of America to continue to embody in our practices the spirit and the program of action embodied in the inscription at the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, not only for the benefit that it will be to individuals who want to come as immigrants to our country but also for awakening in the hearts of people all over the world a sense of fellowship with the people of the United States in a powerful unselfish effort to build a world where there is a good measure of brotherhood, justice, security and decency of man to man.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Graham, can you tell us how many members are in the National Farmers Union?

Mr. GRAHAM. In the national organization, I think it is about 150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many in the State?

Mr. GRAHAM. 40,000 in North Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that roughly be 150,000 families?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right. It is a family organization. As a matter of fact, our membership this year is forty-thousand-five-hundred-and-some-odd families, but it is well over 40,000.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. From the contacts with the officers and members of the union you are in, might I ask you to say something about this uncertainty and anxiety about the possibility of a small farmer getting his feet on the ground that he can call his own. That is, how can not only immigrants from Europe but farmers' boys that have a farm home get started?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad you are asking that question. It is taking a long chance to have a farm-union man on that question. It is a part of the thing I suggested here in the transition that needs to take place in our thinking. In the past we have thought of exporting surplus food, of wasting forests and using up land and moving on west and taking more. For instance, in my home in Pennsylvania in 1902 my father was renting abandoned farms within 50 miles of Pittsburgh and putting fences around them and putting livestock there. They were totally abandoned. Originally they were good farms but they were just farmed out.

Now we say we have to take a totally different attitude. We are going to make use of that land. We are having soil-conservation programs and we are controlling our rivers. The development that could be possible if we wanted to do it would mean that many, many more people could have homes on the land. We believe that the land should be plowed and not left to be blown away. That it should be stocked by the Government for the interest of the future—the total program, including the price program and everything that is geared to the security of the farm family having a home on the land. I think there is no question but what it can be done. There has been a serious sense of insecurity with millions of farm families, and there still is. But we believe we have the conscience and intelligence in this country to redirect our thinking in this program.

I believe that we can't live here with great vast stretches of unoccupied land when other parts of the world are so overcrowded, and whatever we think we can do there is going to be an adjustment of economy in God's universe. We need to be thinking in terms of more development.

I am very much in agreement with things Mr. Eidbo testified to in North Dakota. It is my own conviction when we think in terms of making that part or all parts of the country a home for people, that there will begin a much more intensive use of our land. More education and irrigation and more use of our soil there and many, many more people, not less, are needed to do that.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. But to the present development with the extensive caterpillar and expensive machinery, doesn't it make it a little difficult on the small farms.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does in a certain kind of farming. For instance, wheat growing can be an extensive kind of farming, but vegetable and potato growing may not lend itself quite so well to those extensive ones that you can use in a grain like wheat.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Are the potato farmers becoming smaller?

Mr. GRAHAM. I don't think that is necessarily true. What we have in North Dakota where we have these huge potato farms is the employment of Mexican families where the social conditions are deplorable and a disgrace to the civilization we represent. There are no schools provided for the children and little children are working in the fields. They don't have adequate homes, and if we care anything about human values we need to redirect our whole development of that area so that the land will be a home for people and not something where it may be a few people are on it and then the great masses of people in these conditions that we are almost ashamed to admit. So, there is a tendency for them to become larger.

I think the thing we are representing here, if we want to be a part of the kind of world where there can be a home for people, is to redirect our thinking on some of these issues.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. There has been some testimony here today to the effect that with the mechanization of farming and with the growth of the size of farms there is less land available not only for immigrants but for people already here. Are you saying that, if there was a proper organization of the use of that land, it would be in the best interests of the United States to bring in more people?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right, and I would like to add to it, and I am sure Mr. Eidbo would agree with me, that the use of this large machinery is sometimes not entirely the choice of the farmer. It is partly an emergency situation because he is getting old and can't do the work himself without the large machinery, and his help is gone. He takes it not always as what he considers progress but as a necessity if he is going to stay in the home where he established himself.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Once having mechanized the farm, is it likely the farmer would go back from that procedure?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, sir. I don't think it means they will go back from mechanization. I think there are certain values in mechanization just as there are values in the mechanization of machinery we use to build roads, but we still have more roads to be built and they are not being built. There is work for people to do. There are socially needed services to be carried on, and in agriculture it will not mean we turn back from mechanization necessarily, but even with the machinery we still need more intensive use of land and when you intensify you need more people.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that you would use machinery for wheat where you do need large areas to produce large crops, but in such things as potatoes and beets, where you can raise crops on relatively small areas of land, then it would be economically feasible to have smaller units?

Mr. GRAHAM. And socially very advantageous to our democracy, because the person who owns the land he works on is a better member of a democracy than the man who loses all that sense of belonging.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Is there any reason to believe that with the kind of organization such as the National Farmers Union it would be possible to have a system which would avoid the difficulties you have pointed out about the Mexican labor situation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, we have entered very strongly into that legislation because our observation has been that the main problems in regard to the importation of Mexican labor has not been where family-type farmers wanted them but when great corporate interests were bringing them in and sometimes even avoiding the law to get very cheap labor on these extensive operations. We would say "Yes" that if under the family-type farms additional Mexican labor was needed to be brought in. But you can't have the kind of effort made now to subvert the law. They would want to bring them in on somewhat of an equal basis. The family-type farmer might need one more family and he would have them more integrated with his own family rather than way down on a huge operation.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mrs. Martin M. Cohen here?

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARTIN M. COHEN, REPRESENTING THE COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AND MINNEAPOLIS HADASSAH

Mrs. COHEN. I am Mrs. Martin M. Cohen, and I am here to represent the Minneapolis Council of Jewish Women and the Minneapolis Hadassah.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mrs. COHEN. I am Mrs. Martin M. Cohen, representing the Minneapolis Council of Jewish Women, and Minneapolis Hadassah, whose joint members number over 3,000 women. The views I present are the views endorsed by these organizations both nationally and locally. In the case of the Council of Jewish Women, we have during the past 48 years done service to foreign-born work, meeting the varied needs of the newcomers, of all races and creeds, from their arrival on these shores to their eventual citizenship and complete integration into American life.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. We are interested, not in opening up avenues for Jewish immigration, since world Jewry outside of United States looks to migration to Israel, but we are acting from a recognition, that our organizations, along with other American organizations, have a vital stake in the continuing business of strengthening our democracy.

We believe that immigration laws, particularly Public Law 414, have not brought our laws into accord with our own needs and with world needs, which have developed since 1924.

Although Council of Jewish Women and Hadassah have many objections to Public Law 414, I will confine my remarks to two points, (a) distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens and (b) right of review and appeal.

Native-born and naturalized citizens: The Council of Jewish Women and Hadassah believe that the selection of immigrants should be on the basis of need, merit, love of democracy, and not on racial, religious, or birthplace criteria. Once a person becomes a citizen, he should be able to remain a citizen, unless his immigration was based on fraud or illegal entry. The concept of deportation as a penalty is inhuman and medieval; it most frequently punishes persons entirely innocent, such as members of the family of the deportee. Anyone who does wrong should be punished for his wrongdoing, and held strictly accountable for mistakes and crimes. There should be no distinction between native-born and naturalized. Otherwise we are setting up a second-class citizenry, living under fear, afraid to take an active part in American life. We believe in a single system for punishment of wrongdoers, equal standing under the law for all citizens. We also believe that such distinctions are contrary to the spirit of the Constitution and contrary to the principles laid down by Chief Justice Marshall that the grant of American citizenship is not "a partial grant upon a condition subsequent." Public Law 414 abrogates this principle.

We believe that section 340 (c) providing for revocation of citizenship for joining certain types of organizations will frighten new citizens from engaging in civic or political activity for fear that they may somehow stumble into some error which will rob them of their prized citizenship. Membership for instance in a PTA which concerns itself with curriculum, textbooks, principles of education, and so forth, can conceivably sometime be declared to be "subversive" or any other type of civic activity. This membership could then be the basis for revocation of citizenship. This is the very kind of "silence of fear" which we criticize the totalitarian nations for. We believe that there is sufficient protection in the present laws against fraudulently denying totalitarian beliefs or affiliations at the time of naturalization, or of obtaining citizenship by fraud and material misrepresentation. We recommend that this provision be eliminated.

Right of review and appeal: Public Law 414 denies immigrants the right of appeal either to a Board of Immigration Appeals or a Visa Review Board. Opportunity to obtain a visa is denied any alien who may appear to the examining officer to be excludable. Under present law consular officials have the right to deny visas. We urge that a Visa Review Board be established to review and reverse consular decisions, if necessary, when appealed to. Such Board should provide an opportunity for an American citizen or organization interested in bringing an alien to this country to appeal on his behalf to an administrative body in the United States. We further recommend that existing procedure be retained, whereby appeal may be made to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization from a decision of a lower official to exclude an alien, and from the latter's decision, if adverse, to the Board of Immigration Appeals. Our American courts

are so set up that there is always the right of appeal. Public Law 414 abrogates this widespread principle and puts the future of individuals and entire families dependent on the judgment of a single individual.

The Council of Jewish Women and Hadassah therefore recommend the establishment of a Board of Immigration Appeals and of a Visa Review Board as being an essential part of our immigration laws. We also believe that when set up, appeals should be heard as speedily as possible, with a minimum of red tape and delay involved.

In conclusion, on behalf of Minneapolis Council of Jewish Women and Minneapolis Hadassah, I want to express our appreciation to the President of the United States for so promptly setting up an inquiry into the McCarran-Walters Act, and for the caliber and ability of the members of the Commission. We believe that this law made some slight advances in authorizing for the first time immigration quotas to Far East countries and for lifting racial barriers blocking the naturalization of a small number of Japanese Americans. However, Public Law 414 also adopted measures to confirm the racist character of the national origins quota system, and, in addition, introduced a series of new and even more restrictive immigration provisions. We regard this law as a major setback to decency and fair play, in our immigration laws. Our laws play a vital role in checking the cancer of communism. We need to bring them up to date to conform with the needs and urgencies of life today. United States is in the position of world leadership. We urge 1952 laws to fit the world of 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Arthur L. Cadieux.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR L. CADIEUX, REPRESENTING THE MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CADIEUX. I am Arthur L. Cadieux, and I represent the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. I am also director of the International Trade Department of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.

The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce subscribes to the policies adopted by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce under date of July 1952, as they pertain to international travel regulations and immigration laws.

The chamber is gratified to note the progress made during the past year by many countries under which visas and other restrictions to travelers have been eliminated or simplified. It urges that Congress and the appropriate agencies of the Government in order to provide the greatest freedom of travel consistent with our national interests give further consideration to the liberalization of: (1) laws and travel regulations of our country controlling the entry of foreign persons on visits or in transit; (2) laws and travel regulations of foreign countries controlling the entry of United States citizens into those countries on visits or in transit. In other words, further to liberalize existing laws and regulations, our Government should endeavor to arrange agreements with friendly nations, so that where visas are required they will be issued promptly without the necessity of producing an excessive number of photographs, police or other certificates, or personally calling on the consul.

The chamber also supports measures designed to modify to the extent consistent with national security, and the purposes of our immi-

gration laws, the existing immigration laws and regulations imposing unfair burdens upon carriers for bringing aliens to the United States.

That's the extent of our statement, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Alexander Granovsky, you are the next witness.

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER GRANOVSKY, PROFESSOR OF ETHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, REPRESENTING THE UNITED UKRAINIAN AMERICAN RESETTLEMENT COMMITTEE OF MINNESOTA

Professor GRANOVSKY. I am Alexander Granovsky, 2101 Scudder Street, St. Paul, Minn. I am a professor in ethnology at the University of Minnesota and I have been helping with the resettlement of the Ukrainian, Latvian, and other displaced persons in Minnesota. I am also foreign students' adviser at the university.

I am appearing here both as an individual and as a representative of the Ukrainian American Resettlement Committee of Minnesota, which is a registered organization with the former Displaced Persons Commission.

Unfortunately I have no written statement, but I am going to prepare such and send it to the Commission. Today, however, I wish to take up a few points that I think are of interest. Some of them already have been discussed; some of them have not been touched at all. The first one I would like to discuss briefly is the quota system. I believe that the present quota system as it is set up in the McCarran Act is based on antiquated data, and not under present-day statistics and scientific basis. It was based on 1920, the national quota. At the present time, we know that since 1920 and in 1952 the influx of immigration in recent years certainly changed the picture considerably.

For instance, the national quota under the present act does not take into consideration at all stateless peoples; for instance, Ukrainians, which I represent. Not a single individual can come to the United States under the present law as Ukrainians. He has to come as a Russian, Pole, Czech, Rumanian, Hungarian, or anything else, but not as Ukrainian. Yet, there are 40 millions of Ukrainians in Europe in their ethnic territory.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them are in this country, in the United States; do you know?

Professor GRANOVSKY. We count about one million and a quarter in the United States at the present time; that's the conservative estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have come here over what period of time?

Professor GRANOVSKY. Well, of course it is difficult to say, a good many of them are already the third and beginning the fourth generation at the present time, because the Ukrainian immigration started in about the 1870's by a trickle and a very heavy immigration the first part of this century up to the First World War.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they not listed according to the country that embraced the Ukraine at the time?

Professor GRANOVSKY. That's right. That's the point that I am presenting for your kind consideration, that really, according to present law, not a single individual as a Ukrainian can come to the United

States, which is, I think, undemocratic, un-Christian and unfair, and that should be changed because the present act certainly is not fair so far as the quota is concerned. Then, if the quota is to be abolished, if this national quota is abolished, as some of the groups suggest, then I think to be practical still we have to devise some sort of method whereby in a practical way quantitatively it should be distributed all over the world's population that are clamoring to come to the shores of the United States. I think that perhaps it would be even a more difficult problem than the national quota problem. I am speaking from common sense practicability.

I would like even to suggest that even those who do present their point of view against the national quota themselves perpetuate national entry in the United States, which is also very important to take into consideration. I take the point of view of pride in my nationality rather than shed it. That's the point of view I take, and if we abolish national quota I believe there might be more room, for corruption and world organization to stampede a given group into the consulates throughout the world in order to gain the first part of the year admission, and those who are less informed or less organized will not have a chance to come to the United States. I foresee such a possibility.

I think that some practical way could be devised to provide a fair representation the world over, to various people, to admit them on a quantitative basis.

My next point is that of naturalization. Since the President's Commission is charged not only to consider the immigration law, but also naturalization as well as deportation, and other features connected with it, I would like to call your attention to the fact that at the present time we are seriously troubled by displaced persons, people who came to this country and adjusted themselves very nicely and upon application for citizenship, say either a declaration of intention to become a citizen or for final citizenship papers, a fictitious nationality is being attached to their paper. I am speaking again of Ukrainians, stateless people, who fought against communism for a good many years, and against Russian imperialism, and came to this country, and here they have to carry in their paper that they are Russian and not Ukrainian, because citizenship is considered as synonymous with nationality, and I wish to again emphasize that I know some people who were born under the Czar's regime and are classed as aristocratic citizens, then as communistic Russian citizens, then for years under the Ukrainian Government they were shown as Ukrainian. Then under the Versailles Treaty given to Poland and they became Poland citizens, and then they escaped from Poland and they became stateless and became known as nonstate citizens, and so on and so forth until they became a displaced person, and then came to the United States under the Displaced Persons Commission to become an American citizen; and yet he had about a dozen or so variety of citizenships listed in his papers, and I think that he is only Ukraine by blood, and that is extremely important to consider, and it is only the case with the stateless disenfranchised and persecuted people—it is not the case with those that are more fortunate and have their own states.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been told about that, Professor; there have been other representatives in other cities who have posed the same problem to us. So we are familiar with it.

Professor GRANOVSKY. I am glad that the other people also presented this problem, because this is an exceedingly difficult problem to those people who have their papers with fictitious nationalities.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir. Are you going to file a statement with us?

Professor GRANOVSKY. I am going to file a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Kindly send it to our office in Washington.

Professor GRANOVSKY. I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Rev. Daisuke Kitagawa here?

STATEMENT OF REV. DAISUKE KITAGAWA, ADVISER TO THE LOCAL CHAPTER OF THE JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

Reverend KITAGAWA. I am Rev. Daisuke Kitagawa, and I am here not as a representative but as one of the advisers of the local chapter of the Japanese-American Citizens League, and I have no statement to make excepting to say our local chapter has received a communication from the national headquarters, that the Japanese-American Citizens League has filed or is going to file a statement from the national office.

Therefore, our local chapter is not to testify here, even though we had asked for a space of time this afternoon, sir. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. They are going to file a statement?

Reverend KITAGAWA. That's right, from the national office, with which our local chapter concurs.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Mr. M. Masoka has already been invited to testify at the national hearing in Washington.

Reverend KITAGAWA. Yes, I think that's the reason they advised us not to make a separate statement here.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Could you tell us, Reverend, something about the number of persons—of Japanese extraction in this area—how they have settled?

Reverend KITAGAWA. Just about 1,000 in round number, and most of them are living in the Twin Cities, and their immediate suburbs.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Are these the people that most recently came from the west coast?

Reverend KITAGAWA. That's right. Before the war there were only a handful of Japanese people in this area. Therefore, the majority of them are here as a result of mass evacuation from the west coast.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Have they been able to find employment and housing without much difficulty?

Reverend KITAGAWA. I am very happy to report that we have had a most satisfactory adjustment here in this area, due to the wonderful cooperation of various agencies and groups who have helped us out.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Forrest G. Moore here?

STATEMENT OF FORREST G. MOORE, FOREIGN STUDENT SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Professor MOORE. I am Prof. Forrest G. Moore, 302 Eddy Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. I am foreign student adviser at the university.

I have a statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be pleased to hear it.

Professor Moore. The interest expressed by my point of view may be a somewhat narrow one inasmuch as it affects only some 60,000 to 75,000 persons each year. Yet, in a certain sense, it affects a much wider audience in every country of the world. I refer to those sections of immigration law that control the movements and affect the attitudes directly and indirectly of individuals who come to the United States for periods of temporary study, training, or observation.

The immigration law of the United States with its far-reaching effect is no less a foreign policy document than any of the many acts of Congress that are so labeled. It seems almost too obvious to need to be stated here, that whatever basic policy we adopt must meet the tests of the broadest possible humanitarian interest, and the criticisms leveled by those who are in disagreement with us rather than the applause of our friends. Our immigration policy should be rooted in a philosophy that is as basic and as selfless as the universal bill of human rights.

Having said this, I would like to call the Commission's attention to what may be some inconsistencies of the present immigration law particularly in view of its foreign policy implications, and laws that have to do with the exchange of students.

First. The present law appears to be based, at least partially, on the principle of reciprocity. That is, we give somewhat similar treatment to the nationals of other countries as their country accords to us in immigration matters. I would like to submit to you that we need to go further than this and establish a policy that leads rather than follows the policy patterns of other nations.

Our system of quotas based on the year 1920 says to every national of a foreign country whose quota is based on it that we feel that the present or past composition of our population is the best possible composition, and we want to maintain it regardless of the effect it may have on your attitudes. Why not a system of quotas based on equal treatment for the nationals of all countries of the world? Equal numbers in ratio to the population? Why must we persist in the discriminatory system that is now being perpetuated by our immigration laws? Do you feel, or does anyone feel, that we need to persist in a system that is based on quotas of a certain year?

Second. And this relates specifically to the students, trainees, and professors who visit us from abroad. Is there not some way that we can amend our laws so that they take into account the special nature of this strategic group and the effect that their encounters with the restrictions of the law may have upon them? We have been fortunate in this area to have had representatives of the Immigration Service who believe strongly in the desirability of the exchanges of personnel and who leave our students with an almost uniformly pleasant impression of their experience with this branch of our government. But the stories we hear from our students who move to other areas of jurisdiction, or of their impressions at the ports-of-entry on the occasion of their first entrance to the United States, or on their return from visits to Canada or to Mexico are quite another matter. These encounters with law-enforcement officers remind them of the controls exercised in dictatorships and Communist-dominated countries, and are not what they expected in a democracy. Some of the changes suggested are:

(1) A change that allows the wife of a student, professor, or trainee to accompany him to the United States and exercise whatever skills she may have in employment, whose benefits are used to assist the student, professor, or trainee to further his education.

(2) A change in basic policy that allows the immigration official to regard the student, professor, or trainee not as a prospective immigrant but as a foreign national with special privileges because of the mission that he is performing. While this has been partially accomplished by the exchange-visitor program of the Educational Exchange Act of 1948, our basic policy of immigration is really one of regarding the alien as an immigrant unless he is able to prove otherwise, rather than that more consistent with your ideals, "regarding him as a nonimmigrant unless we are able to prove otherwise." I am aware that many persons who come here temporarily use the loopholes in the law to stay here permanently, but I would also maintain that one of the major reasons that this is so, is our policy of quotas that closes the door to so many through an arbitrary method of establishing who shall be allowed to immigrate. Why shouldn't we face realistically this problem and admit that a number of persons who come to the United States temporarily might conceivably decide after they enter the United States that they wish to remain permanently? Why don't we establish within each country's quota a percentage of quota that could legally be used by this group? Certainly I would be in favor of the strictest sort of qualifications for this privilege, but think of the time that would be saved that is now devoted to the introduction by Senators and Representatives of private bills in Congress. And who is to say whether a foreign electrical engineer will make his greatest contribution to the world as a national of his own country or as a naturalized citizen of the United States?

(3) Provision within the immigration law itself that recognizes the importance of the exchange-of-persons movement and brings its importance to the attention of all those who have a function to discharge in the administration of immigration policy. Some may say this is special privilege, but it is not. It is recognition that the contributions made by this segment of the great mass of persons admitted temporarily to the United States may be enhanced both here and when they return home, by conditions of fearing that are restricted as little as possible by regulation, and hampered not at all by feelings of inequality.

Third. And last, that some recognition be given in amending legislation to the necessity for coordinating the basic points of view of those in the Department of State and the Department of Justice who are charged with administering whatever immigration law may be in effect. And this is not so much at the higher levels as it is at the level of contact with the foreign national. Granted that a system of checks may be needed, certainly it is not intended that each service should serve as a scapegoat for the other. The port-of-entry official needs to have some concept of the job of the American consul and vice versa. Both of them ought to have some opportunity to see themselves as the foreign national sees them.

I suppose that these points are really minor ones when they are ranged alongside the many other considerations which go into the making of an equitable immigration policy, yet I must say that I feel

that many of them are at the heart of some of our present difficulties.

Until we recognize that the language and conditions of immigration law are no less foreign policy than are the Fulbright Act or the Educational Exchange Visitors' Act and the point-4 legislation, I do not believe we will write an immigration bill that is consistent with the declared principles of democratic government in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Rev. Andrew Kist here?

STATEMENT OF REV. ANDREW KIST, PASTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S GREEK ORTHODOX UKRAINIAN CHURCH, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Reverend KIST. I am Rev. Andrew Kist, pastor of St. George's Greek Orthodox Ukrainian Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

I have a prepared statement I wish to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Reverend KIST. As the pastor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Minneapolis, I have been for many years in daily contact with the newcomers to the United States—the displaced persons. Most of these people are from the Ukrainian nation. I was helping these people to adjust to America—helping them to find living quarters and jobs. I was in contact with businessmen, and many factories. The newcomers, many of them professional people with many years of practice and experience behind them, many of them with degrees from the foreign universities, when they arrive in this country take any kind of work—doing janitor work in the large office buildings, washing dishes, digging ditches, factories, farmers, laborers jobs—until they can readjust themselves. In the meantime they dress their children better than they have ever been dressed, they are given milk and eggs and good wholesome food to eat—many of them sending their boys to the United States Armed Forces. They are happy to see their children in good schools, well dressed, and seeing them develop into good American citizens. They can attend the church of their choice and in their own language—this gives goodness of heart. They send some help to Europe—money and clothes to help those left behind.

The managers of factories are very satisfied with the people that have come. People from the city plan to buy farms—they look for other places to live. They do not live in one community but spread out living among the Americans. The newcomer in America perhaps came from behind the iron curtain and they do not forget terrible hard life in Europe under the Communist rule or the Nazi government. God made America the fortress of liberty and protector of human rights. Now America must do what is human and right for ourselves. Basing the quota on the 1920 census should be changed so that the deserving people—people that cannot come in under the present law—will be able to come to America and make their home here. Law of 1924 is too old; for example, Ukrainian people, Russians, Poles, Rumanian, Yugoslavs.

People that are coming to America naturally must be checked very carefully and with the help of sponsors. I know that America has a good system to control that. Only we humbly ask that they permit honorable and able-to-work people that can adjust to American life

to come here. God help America as she has assumed great responsibility in leadership of the world. May God help us all. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Miss Leni Cahn?

STATEMENT OF LENI CAHN, CASE-WORK SUPERVISOR, INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Miss CAHN. I am Leni Cahn, case-work supervisor, International Institute, 183 West Kellogg Boulevard, St. Paul, Minn. I represent that organization.

If I may, I should like to read a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Miss CAHN. It is my impression, after listening to the views expressed here today, and after examining the reactions to the McCarran-Walter bill expressed by groups and organizations all over the country, that there seems to exist almost unanimous agreement as to the need for certain modifications. Those who are concerned about the humanitarian aspect of the law seem to have reached the conclusion that the new law is biased and discriminatory and, that with the perpetuation of the inequitable and rigid features of the quota system, the new law does not take into consideration the actual needs and situations which force certain countries to seek new havens where their surplus population can be absorbed.

Since I have only a few minutes to express the views of the International Institute, I would like to refer here to two points only, about which we are concerned.

In the new law the so-called first papers or application for certificate of arrival have been abolished. Future applicants for citizenship, in general, cannot start applying for naturalization before they have spent 5 years in the United States. In the meantime they carry only their certificates of arrival which is no proof of their intention to become citizens of this country. It has been our experience that this has a psychologically and practically bad effect on newcomers. It not only makes it hard for them to convince employers, landlords, unions, and so forth, of their intention to become citizens but, at the same time, the elimination of the first papers adds to their foreignness and insecurity during these first critical years during which they should be given every possible help on their way to their assimilation and acculturation. Therefore, it is our opinion that in case the first paper has been definitely abolished, the alien registration card should state the intent of the newcomer to become a citizen after the legally required 5 years which, of course, would have to be examined and decided upon a case-by-case basis.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Might I interrupt at this point? Wouldn't that delay the receipt of the alien registration card?

Miss CAHN. I don't think it should. I think it could be probably examined at the time when they enter the country, when they are fingerprinted and maybe it could also be mentioned on the back side of the alien registration card that the first paper has been abolished and that they cannot file for citizenship until shortly before they have been here for 5 years.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. I ask that question because there have been complaints to the Commission that the alien registration cards themselves have already been delayed.

Miss CAHN. Yes; that's true, but I think that's something which someone should be able to straighten out. It is an administrative measure here in the country that shouldn't be too difficult to adjust.

The second point concerns the question as to how far the wider population has been kept informed about the new immigration law and how far public opinion has been mobilized. How much does the general population know about existing pressing needs, as well as about the dangers involved in the present immigration issue? The experts in the field and those humanitarian circles who are directly concerned with the application of the new law need not be convinced. They, by now, have formed their opinions and taken a stand in the matter. It, therefore, seems to us that the moment has come where the issues involved should be carefully explained to wider circles. Besides feeding the newspapers, radio, and other public channels, the Land Mannschaften nationality groups, foreign magazines, and other publications should become active participants in a campaign for further legislative accommodations and improvements. An enlightened public would doubtlessly strengthen the position of the President's Commission and, at the same time, would give also the foreign-born in our midst an opportunity to voice their opinions and to take part in an effort directed toward the improvement of the fate of countless members of their countrymen abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Miss CAHN. There is one question I should like to bring up discussed by the representative of the Council of Jewish Women in her statement earlier, pertaining to appeal.

It concerns the question of appeal in cases where a visa has been refused, what kind of an appeal procedure could be set up. This might be a very naive question, but I worked abroad after the war, and have had dealings with the American consulates in Germany, and I have been wondering whether instead of having the case handled completely by a consul, whether the appeal could not first go to the consul general and from the consul general to the Embassy where, in many instances, social attachés or at least somebody in the Embassy could deal with the matter, because in all countries, as far as I know, you have consulate generals in each place.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose a person desires to appeal in a place where there is no Embassy?

Miss CAHN. Well, it just occurred to me as one of the things that might be considered.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Mrs. Cahn, I just have one question with reference to your first point about the declaration of intention. Now, under Public Law 414 it is permissive for an alien to declare his intention to become a citizen, although not required.

Miss CAHN. Yes, but our experience has been many people have filed for first papers through our channels, and they have all been returned with a letter saying under the new law it is no longer required. So, they all have been returned absolutely without exception. The letter was sent by the Immigration and Naturalization Service stating very positively that their first paper—

Commissioner FINUCANE. It wasn't taken up further by the Immigration Service?

Miss CAHN. Well, I don't know which grounds we could have taken it up on.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mrs. Alma Foley here?

STATEMENT OF MRS. ALMA FOLEY, REPRESENTING THE MINNESOTA COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN-BORN

Mrs. FOLEY. I am Mrs. Alma Foley, 2290 County Road, Minneapolis, and I represent the Minnesota Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mrs. FOLEY. The case of Peter Warhol will illustrate the need for revising the immigration and naturalization laws of this country. Peter Warhol has been ordered deported; he has appealed the order, and is awaiting a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Peter Warhol came to this country from a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire that is now Czechoslovakia at the age of 2 years. He is a product of the Minneapolis schools and the conditions under which he grew up in Minneapolis, Minn. He knows no other country; speaks no other language.

He volunteered in the service of his country in World War II, although he could have had a deferment. He served for 20 months in the Combat and Utility Engineers, and has an honorable discharge from the United States Army.

He is at present employed in a pole and tie yard, and is a delegate from his union to the Hennepin County Committee of the CIO.

He is married to a native American citizen, has four native-born children whose lives will be torn asunder if the Immigration Service goes through with its plan to deport him. This workingman, father, veteran of World War II, has been ordered deported because he was a member of the Communist Party from 1935 to 1938. This information the Government knew from the alien registration of 1940. The Government knew it when they accepted him into the Army in 1944.

The case of Peter Warhol is similar to a whole series of cases in which men and women are being deported solely for membership or past membership in the Communist Party or some other organization on the Attorney General's proscribed list. There are approximately 250 such cases throughout the country. In no instance has any person in this category, which we call political deportation, been charged with ever having done anything which would warrant the cruel and severe punishment of being torn from family, home, friends, and relatives by deportation. In many cases where charges arise out of membership in proscribed organizations there has been a lapse of 10 to 20 years between membership and the initiation proceedings.

Let me quote from an editorial appearing in the Minneapolis Star of August 12 regarding the case of Carl Latva of Wendell, N. H., another person in this category of political deportees. [Reading:]

The story of that payment was volunteered by Latva in connection with a citizenship application. The result of that freely given information was a Federal

deportation order. This seems hardly possible, but it is so. Here in the United States, where our traditions have always run so strongly against the arbitrary denial of the individual's rights and freedom, a man was actually ordered deported because of a folly innocently committed 18 years ago.

Another case of political deportation here in Minneapolis is Charles Rowoldt. He is 69 years old, has lived in the United States since 1913, has been a resident of Minneapolis for approximately 30 years. Ordered deported in April, he applied for papers to go to his native land, Germany, on forms supplied by the Immigration Service; but is kept in a state of nervous anxiety by communications from the Immigration Service implying that he has not done enough to effectuate his deportation and may face a term of 10 years' imprisonment. He has good reason to feel insecure, since last March, at a time when he was complying with all requirements of the Service, reporting twice a month to an officer of the Service, he was taken by this officer to the Ramsey County jail and bail was required in the amount of \$4,000 to effect his release. This happened at 11 o'clock at night. No warrant was issued for his rearrest; he had no opportunity to inform his attorney. No reason was given by the Service for this arbitrary action.

Harry Roast is 73 years old; he has lived in St. Paul and Minneapolis for 39 years. He is employed as a janitor in a St. Paul cap factory. At the age of 73, work, the pleasures of a quiet life at home and an occasional movie with his wife, is the pattern of his life that was interrupted in January of this year with an order for his arrest for deportation based on a statement made on his alien-registration card of 1940. Anxiety about what will happen to him and the threatened breaking up of her home has had his wife under almost constant medical care since the onset of the proceedings.

I call to your attention this intensification of persecution of our foreign-born because of political beliefs and urge that in giving consideration to a change in our immigration policy this be given serious consideration.

Our present immigration policy is a punitive policy. It is not a policy designed to make immigration and naturalization easier, but rather a policy which is wielded to breed fear and intimidation in those communities where there are foreign-born, children and relatives of foreign-born.

Let us just follow the course of a noncitizen who today has had deportation proceedings instituted against him, and let us use the provisions of the McCarran-Walter law as a vehicle.

Under provisions of this law, any Government agent, so designated by the Attorney General, has arresting power. He does not have to prove the person he arrests is a noncitizen, nor does he have to produce a warrant before making the arrest.

Secondly, after the arrest has been made, bail may or may not be granted at the discretion of the Attorney General. Hearings are held, but what of due process in these hearings? The arresting officer is an employee of the Justice Department, designated by the Attorney General. The examining officer is an employee of the Justice Department, designated by the Attorney General. The hearing officer is an employee of the Justice Department, designated by the Attorney General.

The Justice Department initiates proceedings and sits, through its employees, as judge and jury. The person is guilty in the eyes of the Justice Department, or he would not have been arrested in the first place. How can these hearings be considered unbiased or fair if the Department of Justice and its employees arrest at the outset and pass final judgment? We submit that there should be an application of the Administrative Procedure Act to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, thereby affording the accused at least, a minimum opportunity to fair and impartial hearings.

Not only is the Department of Justice accuser, prosecutor, judge, and jury, but the witnesses are likewise the paid hirelings of the Justice Department. In some instances these professional informers travel from area to area giving testimony against scores of persons faced with deportation. In other instances the Department of Justice uses a person against whom deportation proceedings have been initiated to testify against another and promises the new informer that proceedings against him or her will be dropped because of his or her cooperation.

There is a further phase of our current immigration policy which has been carried over into the future with the McCarran-Walter law. This is the question of the right to bail. Today, and in the future, unless something is done about it, noncitizens arrested in deportation proceedings may be refused bail at the outset. They remain jailed throughout their hearings, and then after an order of deportation has been issued against them they may be kept in jail, without bail, for 6 months more.

As you know, deportation cases can be, and often are, long and dragged out. There is no time limit as to when the Justice Department must hold hearings in deportation cases. Therefore, the non-citizen sits in jail until the Justice Department gets ready to hold hearings. But, assume that hearings are held quickly and an order for deportation is handed down, the noncitizen still can be held for an additional 6 months.

Denial of bail at the outset is punishing a person before he has been judged guilty. It is contrary to any semblance of justice, and the Minnesota Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born submits to you that the right to bail should not be taken away from any American, to be citizen or noncitizen.

We urge that there be no power to deny bail in deportation cases, and that in all deportation cases bail in reasonable amounts be granted.

We further request that the 6 months' imprisonment after an order of deportation has been handed down be done away with. This policy of denying bail has resulted in Martin Young sitting imprisoned on Ellis Island for 11 months while final disposition of his case is being made.

Mr. Justice Black dissenting in the March 10 Supreme Court decision in the Carlson case declared, "I can only say that I regret, deeply regret, that the Court now adds the right to bail to the list of other Bill of Rights guarantees that have recently been weakened to expand governmental powers at the expense of individual freedom."

I would like to touch further on the question of bail as provided for under provisions of the McCarran-Walter law. Even if bail has been granted, the Attorney General is given the right under law, to pick up and rearrest noncitizens and increase the amount of bail set.

The McCarran-Walter law has been paraded as a modernization of our immigration and naturalization policy. The power to rearrest and reset bail was not previously a part of our policy and we submit to you that rather than modernization, this repressive measure is retrogression. We urge that that provision be done away with.

The Minnesota committee is unalterably opposed to the racist, restrictive quota provisions of the law. These provisions are absolutely no better than previous immigration quotas.

They further are viciously discriminatory against the Negro people by the arbitrary limitation to 100 the number of West Indians permitted entry from any given colony in 1 year. While slightly raising immigration restrictions for other groups, the McCarran-Walter law singles out the West Indian people for special discriminatory quotas.

Our immigration policy has not only resulted in a pattern of discrimination against West Indians, but the Mexican people have become the target and free game for deportation. Hundreds of thousands of Mexicans are picked up each year and hurled deep into the interior of Mexico, and it is not infrequent that citizens are deported with non-citizens, all deported in such fashion as to make the Constitution and our heritage of human rights and decency meaningless phrases.

Perhaps one of the most undemocratic aspects of the McCarran-Walter law is its provision in relation to naturalized citizens. A high percentage of Minnesotans are naturalized citizens. Their citizenship is very precious to them. Even before passage of this law, because of the broad powers granted the courts in denaturalization proceedings, the courts have grown to consider naturalized citizens as a special category, not quite as good as native-born citizens. According to the McCarran-Walter law a naturalized citizen can lose his or her citizenship because of refusal to testify before a congressional committee. Citizenship can be revoked if a naturalized citizen joins an organization which was a proscribed organization at the time of securing citizenship.

Concealment of a material fact is also grounds for revocation, but the meaning of concealment of a material fact is not spelled out. Furthermore, there is no statute of limitations. I know of the case of a trade-union organizer, James Lustig, against whom revocation proceedings were started 25 years after he became a citizen. The question naturally arises whether the denaturalization proceedings were not started in order to intimidate other foreign-born members of the union.

The Minnesota committee specifically requests that in giving consideration to changes in our immigration and naturalization policy, that a statute of limitations, involving a reasonable period of time, be binding in denaturalization cases.

Once a person becomes a citizen his citizenship should not be easily revoked, but should be an honorable one, one which permits the naturalized citizen to partake of democracy and have democracy extended to him, free speech, choice of association, the right to believe as he sees fit without the constant threat of revocation of citizenship as penalty for any dissenting thought regarding the status quo.

The Minnesota Committee for Protection of Foreign Born maintains that there can be no such restrictive, repressive and unreasonable policy toward the foreign-born without that policy reflecting in gov-

ernmental and administrative attitudes toward the whole American people, native-born as well as foreign-born.

The Minnesota committee respectfully requests that your primary concern be the removal of racist, restrictive, and antidemocratic phases of this Nation's immigration and naturalization policy as the first step toward maintaining a democratic policy for all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

The next witness will be Mr. Francis J. Nahurski.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS J. NAHURSKI, REPRESENTING DISTRICT NO. 10, AMERICAN RELIEF FOR POLAND

Mr. NAHURSKI. I am Francis J. Nahurski, an attorney, and I am here to represent District No. 10, American Relief For Poland.

My statement will be brief. I have in the last 2 months studied the present law as amended in the last session of Congress and have had considerable experience in connection with trying to aid certain people with immigration problems. I find that since the displaced persons law has terminated our old law has been very inadequate and the amendments passed in 1952 have not served to alleviate that condition.

I think that I can state my points of objection under five general headings, and in order not to go too far afield I would like to make them in very brief form.

First of all, I think there should be a removal of the discriminatory features of the law as it relates to the allocation of quotas, with the idea of accomplishing the general objectives of the law under a broad program. In other words, my position is that in passing an immigration law we should have some general objective to which we are aspiring and that there should be no discrimination as to how that objective is to be accomplished on the basis of discriminating against nationalities or regional groups; that it should be done, for example, on a percentage basis of populations of given countries, if possible, if the quota system is to be retained.

The second is because of the fact that world conditions have been changing so rapidly and so drastically in the last few years, it has from experience been demonstrated that very often these quota numbers cannot for various reasons be used up in the given time. So far as possible those quota numbers which are unused in any given year should be recaptured and used in succeeding years so as to accomplish that general over-all objective of the program which I think should be the keystone of our immigration policy and law.

Third: To remove the technicalities which result under the present situation in the very impractical application of the law in very many instances. There are too few discretionary powers and the procedures that are set up are too technical so that they give rise to too many instances where it is impossible to meet the letter of the law, and no one has the authority to exercise the discretion to alleviate the administration of it.

Then, I think there is one additional problem I should like to touch on and that is to plead for some relief for those who have come over in larger numbers most recently and who, because of various reasons, have been separated from other members of their families, whether

they be minors or people of full age, and that the relief be, if necessary, in some form of extraordinary legislation to allow those people, whether they have acquired citizenship in this country or not up to the present time, to effect a reunion with their families so far as it is possible. There are a great many instances in which the families have been separated because some member of the family has been held back for some temporary reason. In the meantime the displaced persons law has expired and the family again has been broken up and is in very much the same situation as it was in the wartime occupation of the belligerents.

In very brief capsule form those are the four points I think are the most important, at least from the standpoint of my experience. Those are points on which I would very much welcome some sort of relief from Congress.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Do I understand you are not in favor of a quota system, or was it that you are in favor of changing the quota numbers within the quota system?

Mr. NAHURSKI. I am not prepared to say that I am against the quota system because I don't know how else it could be limited. If the program envisions a limitation of immigration, then I assume some sort of system of quotas would have to be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. If there were a total ceiling number, how would you handle it?

Mr. NAHURSKI. Well, I imagine under that set-up some sort of quota system would have to be retained, but if that is true then I would favor the elimination of the very obvious discriminations that exist in the present law.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. How?

Mr. NAHURSKI. Against the eastern countries.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you do that?

Mr. NAHURSKI. By creating or establishing some sort of formula which would be more in line perhaps with the numerical population of those areas.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion regarding the national origin system?

Mr. NAHURSKI. If it is possible within the program that we adopt as our program to eliminate it, I would favor the elimination of it or the broadening of it so it would work out on a more equitable basis. I think it is generally conceded that it has not worked on an equitable basis in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by broadening it?

Mr. NAHURSKI. What I am looking forward to, if possible, is to work out a scheme which would eliminate those discriminations. Now, it may be that during given periods of world history people who have a large quota allotment, if we are going to maintain a quota system, have been incapable of using them and nothing has happened under that. I say that if it is a principle of our program to admit 150,000 or 200,000 immigrants a year and it is for the best interests of the United States, and that is what we are all interested in in the long run, then we should not hamstring ourselves with laws that contain such technicalities that, because of these changing conditions in the world, the program cannot be accomplished. That is what I am speaking of.

I don't think that you can accomplish the things that I have in mind within the framework of the present law and I personally have the feeling, whether it is right or wrong, that the present law is not based on any very profound or sound principle of general program or policy over a long period of years; that in many of its aspects it is quite arbitrary and to the extent that it is, it prevents administration flexibly to accomplish the over-all program.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Is Mr. Fred A. Ossana here?

STATEMENT OF FRED A. OSSANA, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR ITALIAN MIGRATION, HOPKINS, MINN.

Mr. OSSANA. I am Fred A. Ossana, president of the Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co. I am here to represent the American Committee for Italian Migration, Hopkins, Minn.

I have been interested in the Italian immigrant ever since 1922 or 1923 when I got out of the University of Minnesota. I am an attorney by profession and I practiced law in this State for 30 years. I was admitted to this State as well as to the Supreme Court of the United States. I was president of the Italian-American Civic League from 1934 to 1938 when I was made an honorary member of the board of trustees. That league is a civic league interested in the advanced education of children of Italian immigrants and in promoting civic activity and participation among Italian naturalized, as well as native-born, of immigrants in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the league a national league?

Mr. OSSANA. Yes, and at the present time that league has merged with the UNICO and is nationally represented in 14 or 15 States. That is the league which was prevalent in the East and was taken from the National Italian Civic League, which is a league that was working from Denver, Colo., to Chicago, Ill. We had chapters in eight States at that time, the time of the merger several years back.

I think that I understand the Italian immigrant as well as anybody in this country. I have mixed with them, associated with them, and I have addressed them all the way from Boston to San Francisco, and I have done that on a number of occasions. I think I have been in every part of this country where there are found any Italian-Americans. I have been very much interested in spurring the parents to giving the children advanced education. In fact, when I organized the league in 1933 we had on that board Mr. Fiorello LaGuardia, the mayor of New York, Governor Horner, the Governor of Illinois, Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin, and Senator Johnson of Indiana, and so on, and they worked with us in promoting these problems.

Since the formation of that league we have given out more than 1,500 scholarships ranging all the way from \$100 to \$4,000 each. Everything that we have been able to do in promoting young Italian boys and girls to go to college and obtain advanced education as doctors and lawyers and engineers and teachers we have done. We have noticed and have been fortunate in witnessing a very fortunate progress ever since it has been started.

I can tell you that when I was at the university from 1914, with a short intermission to graduation, I was the only Italian-American

born student at the University of Minnesota out of 14,000 students. I made up my mind that, if possible, that was going to be corrected; that these sons and daughters of these miners and these street workers and these building workers and railroad workers and farmers should have an opportunity of going to college and making a more wholesome and helpful contribution to American civic life. I think we have been very successful in that respect. That is merely preliminary.

I have had occasion to study the immigration policies and laws and the reports of the Immigration Department, and as a result of the criticism that was advanced against the Italian immigrant, which began in the turn of the century and especially around 1920 or 1925, I made a study of the comparative merits of that immigrant with immigrants from other countries and with our own native-born. For instance, I took the figures on the criminal tendencies and I was much surprised to find that the criminal tendency of the average Italian immigrant or those born in this country of immigrants was not only better than the average of the European immigrants who had come here from other sections of Europe, but it was much better than our own native-born Americans. In other words, contrary to the general impression that there was a high criminal index among the Italian-born immigrant or the children born of Italian immigrants the reverse was just exactly the truth.

I also looked into the statistics on inebriety and contrary to the general impression, because of the common usage of wine as a beverage in Italy, I found that we had less people in feeble-minded institutions due to drunkenness of any nationality in the United States. I also found that convictions for drunkenness were in the lowest bracket of any other nationality in the United States.

I was also impressed since I came of immigrants myself who came here around 1885, and I was 1 of 11 children. My father worked in the iron ore mines of Michigan in the nineties when the wage of under ground bosses was \$1 a day. I had the privilege of working in those mines when I was 18 or 19 years of age on a 12-hour shift for \$0.75 a day. From that time on and after I got to the university I made a little study of Italian immigration and, as you know, the great influx of Italians came in 1890 and on up to 1914 and 1915.

In my trips around the country I found that everywhere there was hard work to do, the Italians were doing it. They laid the rails, and they were laying the rails at that time across the continent under the blazing sun and living in little shacks and railroad cars. I went to West Virginia and Pennsylvania and I found that a great portion of the men underneath were Italian men and boys. I found a great many of them doing farming in various sections of the country. I found them doing street work in Boston, New York, Chicago and in some of our Midwest and western cities. I found a great many of them engaged in building trades and whenever they were in that trade they were doing the hard work, not the bossing.

I made up my mind then that the Italians had made a great contribution to the physical development of this country for which they had never received proper recognition. When we were short of that kind of help, for the dirty work, the Italian man did it. I was all over this country from New Orleans to New York to San Francisco and not one of them but hundreds of thousands and millions of them

were doing that kind of work. I think they made quite a contribution to the building of America in those years and subsequent to that time.

Now when I think of how Italy needs help the most—and I know we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars there in the last 7 or 8 years—and then hear that our own immigration has been cut off, you realize that they have to absorb all the immigrants of Africa and Yugoslavia and other countries with no outlets at all. When I was over there on my last visit they were farming every single foot on the sides of the mountains. When that time of greatest distress came we shut off immigration. I also think it comes at a time when our country needs that kind of economic help the most. I ran a farm for 10 years. I had all kinds of employees. The kinds of employees I had were the ones looking at the want ads every night and left you the next day, and that was at a time when I was raising things for the armed services. We raised German shepherd dogs that my wife gave to the Army. We were engaged in producing milk and beef and every other day or every other week an employee would get up and leave when we were trying to raise pedigreed products to do the best job for defense as well as the man on the front line.

The condition has not changed since that time. Just speaking locally, I know that a number of my friends—we were running the Dayton farm—on some of the best farms in Hennepin County say they can't run them because they can't get employees who are loyal and willing to put in a day's work for a good day's pay. The average farm hand before the war was getting \$25 a month and now he is getting \$135 and \$150 a month and board and room, and you can't keep them for that. As soon as they see an ad in the paper for \$20 a day in a defense plant they are gone. Nobody can fill those spots better than the Austrians, the Italians, or the Yugoslavians, who will give you a day's work for a day's pay.

I think it would be economically sound, not only in the needs that Italy has now—the surplus of employees, workers—but the dire need we have for that kind of help, to bring them in. I also think it would be sound economics, from the standpoint of assistance in dollars we are giving Italy, if we could absorb some surplus population of hers and then we wouldn't have to give her so much. Which, gentlemen, you are going to find very important as this international situation develops.

It has been hard for me to understand and hard for the leading Italian-Americans throughout the country to understand why the quota for Italy was reduced to the minimum figure it was reduced to. In fact, it makes immigration from that country nonexistent, and I can't see the justice of the base that they have adopted for the number of immigrants that should be admitted from Italy. I think a large part of it was based on pure prejudice. Some of the gentlemen from the South and one or two gentlemen from elsewhere who had, I think, a good deal to say in basing those quotas were absolutely unfair in their consideration of the contributions those people have made.

The Italians have not only made their contribution from the standpoint of physical effort in the upbuilding of this country, but I think everywhere from New York to California you find their participation in civic life and social life in the community has been greatly en-

larged, and you can see that they are making a real contribution of value both in business and in the civic and social life of the country.

I know that I speak as one voice when I say to you that the 6 or 7 million or more Italian-Americans in this country feel that a great injustice has been done by reason of the changes and the restrictions imposed in our immigration laws ever since the period after the First World War, and they very much hope that a more liberal and more generous interpretation will be made and that changes will result in the immigration law which will afford a generous immigration from Italy to this country in the very near future.

I am sorry that I haven't a more concrete and a more studied statement ready for you. I have been out of the city and didn't know until I looked at this letter that I had been invited to testify here today. I am very thankful to you for the opportunity of appearing before you. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Commissioner FINUCANE. You spoke of the dire need of farm help. In what area were you referring to?

Mr. OSSANA. Especially to the Minnesota area with which I am quite well acquainted. I don't know if it exists elsewhere, but I am sure it can't be very much different elsewhere than it is here. I know that with these farms around here it is just nip and tuck when they can get employees to carry on, and the reason some of them sold out these wonderful establishments that have been growing and developing for many years is because they couldn't get the right kind of help to handle them.

Commissioner FINUCANE. What type of help?

Mr. OSSANA. Dairy farms, as well as beef and grain farming.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Are these dirt farms or gentlemen farms?

Mr. OSSANA. Both dirt and gentlemen farms. I think they are the most efficiently run farms in the State. There is nothing better than I have seen among the dirt farmers or anything else, than the Griswold farm or the Dayton farm and several others.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Were they sold?

Mr. OSSANA. They were just auctioned off.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Who is running them now?

Mr. OSSANA. They are not being run at all today. The Dayton farm is going to be parceled out for home building sites, and there was one of the finest herds in America.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. How many people did they employ altogether when they were able to get help they needed?

Mr. OSSANA. Well, I imagine Bolder Bridge must have employed 20 or 25 people. I employed as high as seven. The Griswold farm had at least 15 or 18 employees. I could get a list of 50 or 60 farms like that where they have had just that trouble ever since Pearl Harbor and the beginning of the war.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Up to the present time?

Mr. OSSANA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have heard testimony to the effect that the mechanical developments on the farms have lessened the number of employees, to begin with, and, secondly, that that has resulted in larger establishments, greater areas so that smaller farms have been absorbed into the larger ones and that it has been indicated that because of

that there is less of an opportunity for immigrants or DP's to be absorbed in the farm areas. What is your opinion of that?

Mr. OSSANA. That is true on the prairie where large machinery has resulted in streamlined operation, where there are three or four thousand acres solid in corn, wheat, or flax. You have got that kind of operation there, but you don't have it on dairy farms. You put so many in the fields and so many in milking. I had a caterpillar and two tractors and a hay loader and a baileder and everything else and I still needed that many men to run it, and that was only a small operation—160 acres.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. If we set aside the farm needs in this area or in other industrial areas that you may know of, is there likely to be a continuing demand, as you see it, owing to shortages of labor?

Mr. OSSANA. Yes, sir, I do, unless something happens in this country when we reach a stalemate and our production is such that business goes backward instead of forward. When you reach a saturation point in cars, radios, television sets, and sewing machines and all the other things that make up the comfort and luxury of the American family, maybe so. I don't think we have reached that point. I think there are still millions in this country without bathtubs.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. In this particular area what would you say the shortage is in?

Mr. OSSANA. For the common laborer. Even if you advertise at \$1.60 or \$1.70 an hour you can't get them. I can tell you that because I have had ads in the paper looking for them.

The CHAIRMAN. You talk about 6 or 7 million Italian persons in this country who did what you described as the dirty work, the hard work all over the continent. What has become of them?

Mr. OSSANA. A lot of them are dead from hard work and a lot of them are crippled with gnarled hands and bent backs who hope their children will have something better. And I speak from visual observation as well as from what I have read.

When I made my research I also found that there were more Italian boys in the Army in the first World War per thousand population than any other nationality. When you look up the Distinguished Service Medals and Medals of Honor you will find a very fair and generous portion of them have been parceled out to those men.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. In your suggestion for relief of this situation in Italy are you thinking in terms of special legislation?

Mr. OSSANA. I am thinking in terms, and I am perfectly frank in saying it, of that, and for the last few years I haven't made any statement on the Immigration Act except in generalizations.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. How would you balance the needs of Italy against the needs of the rest of the world?

Mr. OSSANA. Well, I would liberalize the immigration laws to admit more immigrants from that part of the world.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Is that applying particularly to the European scene?

Mr. OSSANA. That is right.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. You aren't going beyond that for the present?

Mr. OSSANA. I am not well enough acquainted with the rest of the world. However, although I am particularly interested in the Italian

problem, I know there is an overpopulation problem and I would like to see it solved, whether it requires emergency or long-term legislation. I think it is a good policy to do so.

I also might remind the Commission that when the elections were held in Italy the organization which I represent was responsible for sending some 350,000 messages by letter or cable, which I think had some effect on the elections which took place and which surprised some of the people in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been studying the situation in Italy recently?

Mr. OSSANA. I can't say that I have given any intensive study on it. I have talked to a lot of people who have been over there in the last year. A few friends of mine have told me about changes that have taken place since 1935 and 1940.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you made the statement that it has a population of 45 or 48 million people in an area the size of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. OSSANA. Approximately.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, approximately is close enough. And you said that you have found in the statistics that the land is not sufficient to properly sustain that population.

Mr. OSSANA. Not anywhere near sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. If efforts are made to relieve Italy of part of its excess population—they desire to come here, say—would that be a permanent relief or would that just be taking temporary remedial steps, and would the population in a few years again be to the point where it would be impossible to support it?

Mr. OSSANA. Yes, if you give them temporary relief. I think the immigration law should be on the basis of a long-time program. You can't simply say that you will open the gates for 1953 and 1954. I don't think you will relieve anything by doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the policy ought to be to admit a large-number from Italy every year?

Mr. OSSANA. I wouldn't say a large number; I would say a fair proportion based not on a 2 or 3 or 4 percent basis, but based on the same quota percentage as some of the northern Europeans have gotten.

The CHAIRMAN. What position would that place us in with respect to other nations that have overpopulation problems?

Mr. OSSANA. Well, of course, we probably can't take care of the whole world and we can't take care of a lot of people in the Far East and the South East because their contribution to America has been down to a minimum in comparison with what the Europeans have done for this country. Our country is based on immigrants who have come from Italy, Germany, France, and England. I don't think we have to worry about hundreds of millions of those peoples in the far corners of the earth. We can give them methods and intelligent leadership that will teach them how to sustain themselves without having any thoughts of absorbing them by the hundreds of thousands into our country. That would only lead to disaster if we thought we could form a program based on that kind of help.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you suggesting that our greater obligations are in Europe?

Mr. OSSANA. I think so.

You see, the overpopulated countries of Europe have also been hit by conditions in Argentina. The Italian is a very prominent citizen there. Whatever Argentina has done up to Peron's regime has been largely due to the hard work and intelligence of the Italians, spurred on by special inducement, as in Brazil. I can tell you from stories I have read and personal incidents that I have had, some of the greatest citizens of that country are citizens of Italian descent.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Is there opportunity for immigration to Argentina and Brazil?

Mr. OSSANA. As I understand, it is practically cut off right now.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Has it not been quite heavy?

Mr. OSSANA. Quite heavy up to about 10 years ago. I am sorry I don't have the figures on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Rev. Denzil A. Carty here?

STATEMENT OF REV. DENZIL A. CARTY, CHAIRMAN, MINNESOTA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Reverend CARTY. I am Rev. Denzil A. Carty, clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, director of St. Phillips Church in St. Paul, representing the Minnesota State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, St. Paul, Minn.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Reverend CARTY. I might say by way of preface that my interest in this whole situation is a very real one because I am a naturalized citizen of America. I came to this country from the British West Indies at the age of 16 and went right to work, attending night school while working days. I attended the College of the City of New York days and worked nights. Then later I went to the seminary and served in the Army as a chaplain during the last war and I have been in the ministry ever since 1934 when I was ordained in the priesthood.

The Minnesota State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as well as the three affiliated branches located in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, have gone on record in support of the Humphrey-Lehman immigration bill and in opposition to the McCarran-Walter immigration bill. The changes which we think would be desirable in the present law are essentially those changes which were proposed by the Humphrey-Lehman bill. A more detailed statement of our reasons for supporting some of the more important changes will be given to you by Mr. Leland of our committee on legislation.

I should like to emphasize most strongly the need for amending the existing law so as actually to remove discrimination against prospective immigrants because of their race. I realize that the present law has language which states that no person shall hereafter be excluded from the United States because of his race or color. I also know that the law now permits persons of all racial and national backgrounds to become naturalized citizens. I approve these provisions as representing progress in the right direction. However, racial discrimination has by no means been eliminated from the present law.

For one thing, persons of oriental ancestry must come in under racial quotas, rather than under the quotas of the countries where they

have citizenship. Furthermore, the quotas of 100 persons per year which apply to many countries having large proportions of colored peoples in their populations are racially discriminatory in their effect. Provisions such as these are gratuitous insults to our own American citizens who are the members of nonwhite racial groups. Moreover, such provisions will certainly not win the confidence or respect of colored peoples in other parts of the world.

The organization that I represent is very keenly interested in the impression America makes upon the nonwhite peoples of the world. How serious it is, I suppose, only those of us in the organization and the people who are working in like fields can appreciate, but anything that can be used as propaganda that our country is in any way discriminating against nonwhite peoples is something that we would like to eliminate because of America's opportunity to be the real leader of the world and to really help the nonwhite peoples of the world.

So I am here, like my organization in other parts of the country, to urge that the present bill be amended or that the Lehman-Humphrey bill be substituted so that these discriminatory tendencies can be eliminated and our immigration quotas set up without the slightest regard even subtly or indirectly to racial discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Wilfred C. Leland, Jr.?

STATEMENT OF WILFRED C. LELAND, JR., ON BEHALF OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, MINNESOTA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

MR. LELAND. I am Wilfred C. Leland, Jr., appearing on behalf of the legislative committee, Minnesota State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Minneapolis, Minn.

Our legislative committee as well as the membership of the organization has rather carefully considered some of the provisions of this act which we believe to be discriminatory in racial terms and also which we believe to be in opposition to a sound democratic program for people generally apart entirely from the racial factor. Perhaps the only thing we can actually contribute here—we can probably contribute nothing new in addition to testimony given you before on various of these points.

I know there are many people much more expert on the immigration problem as a whole and on the particular points they are concerned about than we are. What we can do perhaps is to point these things up as things that have been of concern to our organization and to the people in it. It is an interracial organization, as you know, concerned not only with the relation between white and Negro people in the United States, but concerned with making democracy work more effectively throughout the world.

Reverend Carty mentioned the first point, of course, this racial origins provision, which we feel is undesirable and should certainly be eliminated. In fact, our suggestion would be that all racial discrimination as such should be erased at every point.

The second point about which we are concerned is the basis for the present quotas, which I believe are now still using the 1920 census figures. We believe, along with Senator Humphrey and Senator Lehman, that it should be changed to 1950 and continuously changed every 10 years as the new census is taken. It seems to us that would be the proper way to keep our immigration policy abreast of our actual population groupings nationalitywise and to give proper opportunities for people of various groups to come in and join their relatives and friends from the same country who have come before them.

We believe also that the pooling of quotas is desirable. We think that our immigration policy should be to have the maximum figure set with a view to the number of people that can be successfully absorbed in our economy from year to year, and we think we should admit that full number. If the people from certain of those countries don't need to use those quotas, they should be pooled and passed on to people who are waiting in line to get on to a quota from another country.

A fourth point is that we believe we should continue to be, and be much more successful than we think we have been under the present legislation, a haven for refugees and escapees from political persecution in other areas of the world. It seems to us that one of the great hopes for ultimate peace and democracy throughout the world is to gradually sell our democratic system to the individual persons under dictatorial government, and if we can assure them they will have a haven if they leave there and come outside and show their opposition to the system under which they now live, it will give great hope and encouragement to movements that will eventually change those situations completely. It seems to us there should be special provisions for welcoming persons in those categories into the borders of the United States.

Related perhaps to that fourth point is the fifth one, about which I might say the same: we think that legislation should be based on the concept that individual people can be reformed and improved as individuals and that they can change their views and can change their allegiance to a system of government and so forth. We believe, in other words, that persons who have once belonged to the Communist Party in some country or once belonged to the Nazi Party or some other group should not forever be excluded, but if they give evidence of having subscribed to governmental principles which we believe in they should be admitted and we should recognize the fact that this kind of progress is possible in the individual. We think the law should take that into account.

The sixth point relates to the matter of procedure, which at the present time in the present law we understand there is given a good deal of rather arbitrary authority to individual representatives of the United States Government in foreign countries to make administrative procedures about either admitting or refusing persons who may apply for admission to the United States. We believe that all such decisions should be subject to review by proper review machinery. We don't have specific proposals for this, but generally speaking we think there should be no opportunity for some individual, because of prejudice or arbitrary whims of one kind or the other, to be able to make final decisions on one individual who has no chance of appealing

that to an impartial agency to give him relief if he has been treated unjustly.

The seventh point also relates in one sense to procedures. Perhaps I should go further than that. We understand the act will go into effect in January and that it provides for the deportation of persons who have become naturalized citizens but who were subsequently found to be disloyal to the United States and so forth. In other words, citizenship of naturalized citizens is not the same as that of native born citizens. This, we think, is wrong. We think a naturalized citizen should have the same rights and privileges and security as a citizen who by chance was born here in the United States.

I think the final point we might like to mention is that we think the legislation should take into account the integrity of the family as an institution and should give more special opportunities than are given, and I admit I don't know how the present law reads in that respect. At least, if it does not provide this, we think it certainly should: that members of families should be permitted to come and join other family members who are already in the United States. And this should apply rather broadly to the family groups so that we should avoid the situation that families are broken up because of more or less arbitrary applications of the immigration law.

Those are the major points we had in mind and I think I just would like to close by saying that we believe that this is a matter of concern to all Americans. It is of concern to the members of our organization, who are especially concerned with racial discrimination and problems of racial exclusion, but we believe that the interest of our membership represents the interest of all other citizens of the United States and people of the world who believe in democratic principles.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

A letter has been received from Mr. H. D. Bruce, 2402 Kendall Avenue, Madison, Wis., which will be inserted in the record.

(The letter follows:)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY H. D. BRUCE OF MADISON, WIS.

MADISON, WIS., October 18, 1952.

Mr. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,

*Chairman, Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: May I call to the attention of the Commission a peculiarity of the McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, passed by Congress on June 27, 1952.

Provision is made by the act for foreign wives of American men to enter the United States on a nonquota visa, but there is no similar provision for foreign fiancées. Therefore, the American man must travel to the foreign country of his fiancée simply to have a marriage ceremony performed. Thus the net result of the present wording of the act is to cost the couple up to several thousand dollars unnecessary traveling expense.

I would like to raise the question, "Why not recognize proxy marriages or permit a bona fide fiancée to enter the United States on a nonquota visa?" To preclude abuse it would seem reasonable to permit fiancée entry on nonquota visa only if a bond be posted or suitable guaranty be made to ensure return passage, if the marriage is not contracted soon after arrival and does not remain intact until the wife has been naturalized.

Very truly yours,

H. D. BRUCE.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I request that the St. Paul record remain open at this point for the insertion of statements submitted by persons unable to appear as individuals or as representa-

tives of organizations or who could not be scheduled due to insufficient time.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

This completes the hearings in St. Paul, Minn. The Commission will now stand adjourned until it reconvenes in St. Louis, Mo., at 9:30 a. m., October 11, 1952.

(Whereupon, at 5 p. m., the Commission was adjourned to reconvene at 9:30 a. m., Saturday, October 11, 1952, at St. Louis, Mo.)

STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY OTHER PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE ST. PAUL AREA

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY KENNETH CULP DAVIS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
THE LAW SCHOOL,

Minneapolis 14, October 3, 1952.

Mr. HARRY N. ROSENFIELD,

*President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
1740 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. ROSENFIELD: I have decided not to testify at the hearing of your Commission in St. Paul.

When I agreed on the spur of the moment in our telephone conversation, I had tentatively in mind a protest against the congressional irresponsibility in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1951 in exempting alien exclusion and expulsion cases from the provisions of sections 5, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act. I now find that section 403 (a) (46) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 repeals the provision to which I object. Whether the provisions of sections 236 and 242 (b) will turn out to be fair with respect to the problem of separation of functions will depend upon the practices of the special inquiry officers, and since the new act is not yet in effect, it is too early to investigate that question.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH CULP DAVIS.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MARCIA RUSSELL, STUDENT, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

OCTOBER 8, 1952.

DEAR SIR: As a student and as a voter I should like to express through you my sincere pleas for the modification of the McCarran immigration law. As a world leader and as an exponent of democracy the United States must liberalize its immigration policy.

Sincerely,

MARCIA RUSSELL.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY REV. WILLIAM B. LARKIN, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, INC., DULUTH, MINN.

BUREAU OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, INC.,
Duluth, Minn., October 17, 1952.

Hon. PHILIP D. PERLMAN,

*Chairman, President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
1742 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PERLMAN: Having been unable to attend the recent hearings in St. Paul, I would like to submit this brief statement.

As resettlement director for the Roman Catholic diocese of Duluth which covers the 10 northeast counties of Minnesota, I assisted with the resettlement of over 500 displaced persons admitted under the 1948 act. It is only on the results of this experience that I wish to touch.

Three-fourths of this group of 529 were of Polish, Yugoslav, and Hungarian origin. They are slowly, but surely, finding their niche in our northeastern Minnesota communities. Only two of the group have become public charges and both of these for medical reasons. They have had a minimum of assistance.

Resettlement consisted in locating rental housing, establishing credit of from three to four hundred dollars for the purchase of essential second-hand household furnishings; immediate job placement. In only one instance was there apparent defaulting on repayment of inland transportation or credit extended. Employers, with three exceptions, have given these people excellent work ratings. No effort was made to hold them geographically or employment-wise. Once they became established in the locality and the employment of their choice, they demonstrated their stability.

When I consider the minimum effort required locally to give these people a new lease on life, I have no hesitation in saying that I would be glad to do it for another 500, if Congress sees fit to legislate the possibility. These people, you will note, were predominantly from sections of Europe which our quota system so largely excludes. Their appreciation of democracy will, I feel sure, be a shot in the arm for us native-born Americans in the years ahead. It seems to me we are not going to buy our friendships in Europe with dollars alone, but rather with doing our just share in admitting nationals from overpopulated countries and countries which we have heretofore treated as having less desirable emigrants. I see no evidence of friendship in telling European governments that we will accept their skilled people only. The vast majority of the Poles, Yugoslavs, and Hungarians who came under my supervision were unskilled and employment has not been a problem for them.

Because so many others will be voicing opinions on the discriminatory aspects of the McCarran Act, I have confined my observations to my personal experiences with some 500 immigrants from the countries which our laws pretty much exclude from our shores.

Very sincerely yours,

BUREAU OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, INC.
Rev. WILLIAM D. LARKIN, *Director.*

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1952

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

St. Louis, Mo.

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization met at 9:50 a.m., pursuant to adjournment, in courtroom No. 1, New Federal Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Philip B. Perlman (chairman) presiding.

Present: Chairman Philip B. Perlman, and the following Commissioners: Msgr. John O'Grady, Mr. Thomas G. Finucane, Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson.

Also present: Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will come to order.

Our first witness this morning will be Mrs. Maynor D. Brock.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MAYNOR D. BROCK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATURALIZATION COUNCIL OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mrs. BROCK. I am Mrs. Maynor D. Brock, executive director of the Naturalization Council of Kansas City, 903 Kansas City Power & Light Building, Kansas City, Mo. I am here to represent that organization.

Honorable gentlemen, it is with some apprehension that I come before this panel of distinguished gentlemen to air my views and those of my coworkers on the subject of naturalization and immigration.

In the first place, it seems to me that this very Commission is premature and that the Public Law 414 has not even been administered since it does not go into effect until December 24 midnight. It is perhaps the first attempt in America—this act I refer to—to bring within one comprehensive statute the various laws relating to immigration and naturalization and nationality. It makes significant and forward-looking changes, particularly in the field of immigration. There are 48 measures especially repealed, with provisions for other parts of the act in controversy with this bill also repealed.

To return to this panel: It seems that the writers of this bill in its final form understood the enormousness of such legislation for it established a Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy composed of 10 members, five each from the Senate and the House, three of the majority and two of the minority parties in each branch of Congress, and the members to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House and the committee electing its own chairman.

The task of this committee is to make a conscientious study of the administration of the act and its effect upon the national security, economy, and social welfare of the United States and such conditions within and without the United States which might have a bearing on this subject. It must make reports to both Houses of Congress periodically and, further, the Attorney General and the Department of State are to keep this committee fully aware of all regulations, instructions, and information it requests concerning the administration of the act. Such committee is appointed from the House Judiciary Committee already. I refer to Representatives Walter, Chelf, Wilson, Graham, and Thompson. They will start to work as soon as the Senate committee is in operation.

Mr. Truman, our President, has used almost the same thing in the bill for the order to establish this Commission of which I am speaking.

I wish to endeavor to discuss the quota system after having had a background of 19 years' work with immigration and naturalization. I have no axes particularly to grind, and I am well aware of minority groups who feel that discrimination has occurred for their own people. I am quite aware that the Displaced Persons Act barred from it some Europeans quite heavily and made it quite impossible for some to come in. If these persons were barred by such quota of the skills we need and didn't have the necessary qualifications for immigration, I see no reason why a special bill might not be instituted for such persons. This has been a possibility since 1924. It is still a possibility. Our own economy must still be considered in the light of the possibility of a less stable dollar than we now have.

There was trouble with the Displaced Persons Act until John Gibson and his Commission straightened it out. Even then, great numbers of documents for worthy aliens were mysteriously not found and the screening is questionable in many instances. Mass immigration is exceedingly difficult under the most advantageous circumstances. I realize mistakes have occurred thereby, but the point I wish to make is to hold the line for quotas and make steps slowly before bringing social problems, more folks unadjusted to our midst to be sent away or tormented by petty folks here continuously. It doesn't help to have 12 percent rearing its problem head while 88 percent are not. It is here that the 12 percent of the DP group are malcontent and there are no apparent agencies or communities which are able to do much about them.

So, it seems to me that until screening is a reality in Europe for the betterment of America and for the aliens themselves I would favor the holding of the present quota as approved in this act.

Furthermore, I should want to call your attention to the fact that there has been a long and studied effort made in behalf of this act before it was written. Organizations from all over the United States came to Washington to testify to their best knowledge on these subjects.

I believe further that this bill in its own various 12 parts has much to commend it. Its naturalization procedures are more standardized. That is the goal. The inadmissible aliens are clearly defined. It sets down classes of deportable aliens and they are now more inclusive than formerly, particularly as far as the criminal alien is concerned. The procedural safeguards are more afforded by this new act than

were afforded under the old law. The visa procedures for immigrants and nonimmigrants remains practically the same. Entry and exclusion of aliens have remained somewhat the same. There is, of course, some Department of State regulation which comes into all of these and I think probably that is the place it should be. The re-entry permits are just about the same. There has been no appreciable departure from the former law. I think that the registration of aliens and the address reports coming the 1st of January as they do has lessened the tension for those who are known as noncitizens and then, now that it is only once a year I think perhaps it is urging some of them to become citizens. I think that all those persons who are permanently entered in this country should avail themselves of American citizenship. I approve of it.

I wish we had some way more of putting little needles into it so that we might have more citizens so we wouldn't come across those—and it has been so often in my experience—who have been here 40 years and then come crying, "How can I become a citizen, because in this last act of 1950 I have to read, write, or speak English and I have been tormented by my neighbors because of the fact that I am not a citizen." Especially is that true in the period of national elections. It seems to me that if some urge could be put upon them to become citizens when they come to this country, for them to learn to write, read, and speak English, it would be a very great contribution to our country.

Furthermore, the Government has made it possible for them because in the classes they do provide the books, which I must say are very excellent for their learning.

Of course, the act is a large order and it is a very difficult thing to take into consideration in 15 minutes. These are 845 pages of legislation and law embodied in it. But at the same time I am convinced that with this joint committee we have safeguards and that the bill is to be commended as a whole and that it is trying to be a forward movement. As the law will be administered I think we will find that there are places that can be improved in it, and I hope sincerely that those places will be improved.

I think, gentlemen, that that concludes my testimony. I must say that I have not talked off the cuff: I have talked from experience of years of work. I might say that we have made a very intensive study of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Brock, are there any parts of the new act which you think can be improved?

Mrs. BROCK. As I said in the first place, I think that it is premature. We haven't even tried it. It isn't a law yet, not until the 24th of December, and we can't tell anything about it until we start to administer it. I would hesitate very sincerely to say that I think this, that and the other thing. I am glad that the first paper was not completely wiped off the map. In many instances it can be had and I like that part of it because it means security on the part of some of the industrial workers to have a first paper. But I like the standardization of the naturalization proceedings and the requirements for naturalization, and I am hoping that a standardization will be more clearly written out as to requirements for citizenship, as it is not now done. Perhaps that is one place I would like maybe to see an improvement, but until a directive is given perhaps I too am premature in my suggestion.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do you favor continuing the national origins formula in the quota system?

Mrs. BROCK. I think the national origins are quite correct and I would have them remain so until such a time when we were sure that the assimilation of these aliens who are coming now will make the contribution we expect them to make when they come, rather than to bring great groups in and then settle it after we get them here. That we cannot afford economically and socially. We have a great deal of trouble.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do you think the national origins formula might make the United States vulnerable to a charge of being discriminatory?

Mrs. BROCK. I think under the present act we can say that you are not excluded if you can qualify under immigration and if you are a good person and needed in this country we have provided the numbers that can be brought here per year. No, I wouldn't say that we were discriminatory at all. Certainly we have the same right and we are not the only country in the world who says that we don't want all the peoples of all the world because there are plenty of others, Australia, for instance. As much as we think Australia needs immigration they still have discriminatory policies, and less populous nations than ours continue to refuse orientals.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand, then, that you favor the system of selection as provided in the act?

Mrs. BROCK. I would continue to do it as the law implies, until such a time when the joint committee which was appointed within this law finds it not serving a purpose of leadership in the world, and then I would go along with the joint committee, but I still say that the joint committee was made as a safeguard for such problems. And until that joint committee, which is made up of five in the House and five in the Senate and two of which are majority and two are minority, finds that that is not the case and that we are excluding people we need here, why then I would say that I would go along with that joint committee. Until such a time occurs I still say that the law satisfies us as it is now written, as far as quotas are concerned.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Do you think there should be any distinction between the people of the world, whether European or Asiatic, and so forth, under our immigration system?

Mrs. BROCK. Well, I feel this way, personally. I am not speaking from the council's point of view. Unfortunately the orientals have been discriminated against in former time in that they had to come, whether they were born in South America or Europe of oriental parents, as orientals and, therefore, I would feel that there could be that arrangement made to have them come from the nation of their birth rather than from their nationality origin. I would say that particularly because I have worked with the orientals greatly recently and I have found that that is a great handicap. We have had some very fine orientals in our town who had returned to their country because they had five or six years to wait since they were born in South America and had to come under the oriental quota. That, I feel, was unfortunate and I would like to personally erase that discrimination, if you wanted to call it such.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Our next witness will be Dr. Mihanovich.

STATEMENT OF CLEMENT SIMON MIHANOVICH, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, AND REPRESENTATIVE OF THE VERY REVEREND PAUL C. REINERT, PRESIDENT, ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Dr. MIHANOVICH. I am Dr. Clement Simon Mihanovich, director of the department of sociology, St. Louis University. I am here as the representative of the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University, as well as in my individual capacity.

In behalf of the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert I would like to read you a petition he presents to your Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be pleased to hear it.

(The petition read by Dr. Clement Simon Mihanovich follows:)

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY,
St. Louis, Mo., October 11, 1952.

Public Law 414 has removed the quota-exempt status formerly held by bona fide college and university professors. At the present under the McCarran law only bona fide ministers are exempt from the quota.

Section 101 (a) (27) (F) of the McCarran law, by failing to specifically mention college and university professors, places them within the quota system.

We consider this unfair and detrimental to the best interests of the United States. We, therefore, suggest and recommend that college and university professors, who intend to carry out the work of their profession in the United States, be included in the list of nonquota immigrants.

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL C. REINERT, S. J., President.

Dr. MIHANOVICH. Now, I would like to speak in my own behalf, as a sociologist. I would like to talk about section 2 (b), Executive Order 10329. I am of the opinion that within the last few years the quota of 154,000 immigrants has not been fulfilled. Consequently, I suggest and recommend that a system be devised whereby the quota be filled on a basis of need. This need may be world-wide and should not be restricted on the basis of race, nationally, religion, or origin.

Arguments have been presented by various peoples stating that the United States was incapable of economically supporting an annual admission of 154,000 or so immigrants. In my capacity as a sociologist and a student of population, I am of the firm opinion that the United States can support a much larger immigration quota than the present quota. To cite one example, Harold Moulton, of the Brookings Institute, made a series of studies before and after World War II under such titles as "America's Capacity to Produce" and "America's Capacity to Consume." In his latest work on economic considerations in the United States he is of the opinion that the economic system of the United States is capable of supporting twice the present population at a level of living eight times greater than the present level of living. I realize that the Commission has been subject to petitions such as these. I do not wish to take more time.

I am grateful for the opportunity of presenting Father Reinert's petition and my own petition before the Commission.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. I have just one question to ask with regard to your observation "on the basis of need." Is that world-wide need or is that limited to Europe?

Dr. MIHANOVICH. I think it would be, in my particular opinion, world-wide need.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you then favor admitting immigrants up to the number that this country might need without regard to where they came from?

Dr. MIHANOVICH. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Assuming they met such tests as Congress might authorize.

Dr. MIHANOVICH. A common-sense test.

The CHAIRMAN. And without regard to race, place of birth or national origin?

Dr. MIHANOVICH. That is right.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do I understand correctly that you are opposed to the present national origins system?

Dr. MIHANOVICH. As far as I can see it, I imagine the immigration law has been intended, whether conscientiously or unconscientiously, to aid individuals in certain sections of the world who need aid in coming to the United States. I mean, it is not based upon or should not be based upon any preconceived nations and I am of the firm opinion that the immigration law of the United States as originally conceived under the McCarran law is based upon a concept which is found in the writings of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, a concept which can express itself, I think, in the idea of superior and inferior races.

As a sociologist and somewhat of an anthropologist, that concept is alien to me and scientifically unproven.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do you think our immigration policy is an important consideration in our foreign policy?

Dr. MIHANOVICH. I think it definitely has to be taken into consideration. The foreign policy of the United States has to be taken into consideration, but I am also of the opinion that the foreign policy of the United States when it plays a part in immigration should not operate in such a way as to, shall we say, not take into consideration the lives of individuals—I mean, the United States should not be a cold-blooded instrument using lives of individuals through the process of immigration in order to carry out a foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Rev. Victor T. Suren here?

STATEMENT OF REV. VICTOR T. SUREN, CATHOLIC DIOCESAN DIRECTOR, ST. LOUIS RESETTLEMENT COMMITTEE FOR DISPLACED PERSONS, AFFILIATED WITH NATIONAL CATHOLIC RESETTLEMENT COUNCIL; ALSO REPRESENTING THE MOST REVEREND JOSEPH E. RITTER, CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS

Reverend SUREN. I am Rev. Victor T. Suren, 3835 Westminster Place, St. Louis, Mo., St. Louis Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons, which is affiliated with the National Catholic Resettlement Council. I am also here as representative of the Most Reverend Joseph E. Ritter, archbishop of St. Louis and chairman of our Resettlement Committee.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a prepared statement which I wish to read and at the conclusion of that I would ask the permission of the Commission to make a few brief remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will be glad to hear what you have to say.

Reverend SUREN. I am grateful to the Commission on Immigration and Naturalization for this opportunity to express my views on the present immigration policy of our country as it is represented in the McCarran-Walter Act of June 27, 1952.

For the past 3 years I have held the office of director of the St. Louis Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons and Expellees, which is a local branch of the resettlement division of war relief services, NCWC. The chairman of our resettlement committee is the Most Reverend Joseph E. Ritter, archbishop of St. Louis, whom I have the honor of representing before this Commission. I would like to state further that the St. Louis Resettlement Committee has directly assisted in the resettlement of approximately 1,800 war victims in the Archdiocese of St. Louis during the past 4 years, in accordance with the Federal Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as amended in 1950. We continue to aid these people toward their ultimate stabilization as creditable and honorable citizens of our Republic. The Archdiocese of St. Louis represents approximately one-third of the State of Missouri, the eastern part.

In view of the present world crisis and our country's recognized role of leadership, we feel that our present immigration and naturalization policy is in some respects detrimental to us as a nation and needlessly disadvantageous and discriminatory in regard to peoples of certain nationalities who are in dire need of the help we might give them. It is our studied opinion that a revised policy on immigration should reflect the following:

(1) While it is recognized that immigration must be controlled by a quota system, it is regrettable that our present law continues the deplorable national origins formula. This formula has always been considered to be discriminatory toward the people of countries of eastern and southern Europe. The sting of this discrimination is felt with particular keenness today because the nations so affected are presently experiencing unspeakable economic hardships due to the pressure of surplus populations caused by the last war and the continuing Communist tyranny. The immediate possibility of political upheaval inherent in the economic stress in such countries must not be lost sight of. Such a condition is a very definite obstacle to world peace. Hence we urge the adoption of a more just and equitable system in determining national immigration quotas.

(2) Whereas each year only a portion of the total of admissible immigrants come to the United States, because certain countries do not utilize their full quotas, we recommend the pooling of these unused quotas to relieve, at least in a measure, the overload of excess population in certain other European countries. If we continue to cancel unused quotas, we simply emphasize the discrimination inherent in the present national origins quota formula.

Because we say, in effect, that we could absorb, say, approximately 150,000 people, 150,000 people don't come because certain countries don't fill their quotas. We could take these others but we don't, whereas in our economy we could absorb them. Certainly, as I feel, we emphasize the discrimination against those people: we just don't want you. That is the way it seems to me.

(3) We feel that the present immigration law gives undue preference to professionals and skilled technicians to the prejudice of non-skilled workers. While we recognize the benefits which may accrue to our country from the acquisition of those enjoying preference, we must not be unmindful of the fact that our immigration policies should be inspired also by motives of charity and a desire to assist needy countries. Further, we have learned from our experience in the resettlement of displaced persons and expellees that the nonskilled immigrant has made his adjustment to our American way of life with remarkable ease and bids fair to be a great asset to our national economy. We do have a need for unskilled labor.

(4) The McCarran-Walter Act seems to give to American consuls abroad too broad powers to determine almost arbitrarily the eligibility of potential immigrants. Similarly, naturalized citizens now feel insecure in the possession of their coveted citizenship, because their rights against deportation seem not to be sufficiently protected.

I have had several naturalized citizens who have been here 20 or more years come to me and ask me if they were not in danger of deportation for some slight infraction of a law of our city or State or country. I am just telling you the effect it has had on them.

These suggestions are prompted by a sincere desire to see the United States completely vindicate itself as worthy of its place of moral leadership in the family of nations. We are convinced that a more Christian immigration policy is imperative, not in 5 or 10 years, but now, when the relief offered to suffering peoples by immigration is so urgent.

It is not our thought that the United States can solve the surplus population problems of all the nations alone. We do feel, however, that we must set the example for other countries to imitate. Our present immigration law hardly sets a good example. We have inaugurated and are pursuing plans and programs for the relief of impoverished and backward nations. We have done this to thwart communism and foster peace and freedom. We have done this at a great cost to our nation. Much of our efforts in this regard, we feel, will come to nought, unless we demonstrate qualities of moral leadership. A more humane immigration law, a law more in keeping with our American traditions, seems to be demanded by our position in world affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Reverend SUREN. I wish to add these few reflections. We recognize that the number of immigrants ought to be determined by a careful study of our economy. Certainly we say that it should not be haphazard, unrestricted. It should be planned and the better planned the more successful it will be.

Secondly, whatever be our permanent immigration policy, as long as the crisis of overpopulation exists to such an extent, I do not believe we should rule out consideration of emergency immigration legislation such as we had in 1948, amended in 1950, commonly known as the DP Act.

Thirdly, if we feel our economy can't stand a greater number of immigrants we should be ready to give these immigrants more assistance once they have come here.

As I have stated, our resettlement office of the St. Louis Resettlement Committee continues its interest and its contact with these people. How long? Indefinitely, as long as they need it. They come to our office for anything and everything they might need. We try to teach them the American way of life, to become self-reliant and dependent on their own resources and initiative. We help them not to become public charges and so on. We feel that these people have come over to us under very adverse conditions. They have come to us as war refugees. They have had psychological problems which we would expect immigrants of another time not to have and yet we have found, to our great satisfaction, that the percentage of successful readjustments made by these people is very high. That is why I feel that we could do a little more by way of immigration to our country primarily to set the good example to the world and demonstrate that we are worthier of the position of trust that the world seems to want to give to us as a leader among the nations.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do the views you expressed also represent the views of the Most Reverend Joseph E. Ritter, archbishop of St. Louis?

Reverend SUREN. That is right. In giving this statement I represent his views.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Father, for appearing here and giving us your views and the views of the archbishop.

Dr. Walter Wagner is the next witness.

STATEMENT OF WALTER WAGNER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, METROPOLITAN CHURCH FEDERATION OF GREATER ST. LOUIS

Dr. WAGNER. I am Dr. Walter Wagner, executive director of the Metropolitan Church Federation of Greater St. Louis, 1428 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

I am here to represent that organization and wish to read a statement in its behalf.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be pleased to hear it.

Dr. WAGNER. The Metropolitan Church Federation of Greater St. Louis represents 23 denominations, 600 pastors and more than a half million people. Among our 20 commissions are several that carry deep concern relative to our Nation's immigration and naturalization laws. The ecumenical commission concerns itself with the plight of the uprooted peoples of the world. Our commission on international justice and goodwill is deeply concerned with the political implications of our immigration and naturalization policies. Our commission on human relations feels a responsibility for lifting the barriers in the recent quota system, and our international commission is dedicated to the elimination of all discriminatory provisions based upon color, race, or sex.

Because we feel that other agencies will devote their major emphasis upon one or the other of these defects in the present omnibus bill H. R. 5678, I am devoting my time to the particular need for emergency legislation in behalf of the uprooted peoples of the world. These millions create for the United States and for all liberty loving nations, a moral, economic and political problem of vast proportions. Our National Council of Churches in an official statement lists among the

uprooted peoples those displaced by war, and its aftermath; the refugees made homeless by reason of Nazi, Fascists and Communist tyranny and more recently, by military hostilities in Korea, the Middle East, and elsewhere; the expellees, forcibly uprooted from the lands of their father; and the escapees who every day break through the iron curtain in search of freedom. These millions long to live under conditions of peace and promise. A problem of equal urgency is involved in the surplus populations that cannot now be supported by the economies of their respective countries. The pressure exercised by these surplus peoples is a threat to the stability of the entire world.

We believe it is of utmost importance to the peace and security of our world to adopt policies of justice, mercy and mutual assistance that will erase the great threat of war that these uprooted peoples present. In my travels around a good portion of the world and in many of the refugees' camps of central Europe, I was constantly reminded of the fact that the only people who would tolerate another war are these uprooted peoples.

This is understandable. Their present plight is so pitiable it could not be worse. I have seen 16 people living in one room no larger than the average American kitchen. I have stood at the border and watched the escapees come across to what they thought was a new lease on life only to find themselves herded into overcrowded dilapidated barracks. A new war to them might open up borders that are now closed. It might give them an opportunity to return to the land.

We propose that the United States constantly call this problem to the attention of the United Nations. Its final and total solution can only be achieved there.

As a sign of our good faith, we ask that this Commission seriously concern itself with the task of presenting emergency legislation to the Congress of the United States, providing for the bringing of at least 500,000 of these peoples to our country over a 3-year span. This emergency legislation is not only needed as a humanitarian gesture, but it will be the most effective deterrent to communism. That is our official statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that your views were addressed mainly to the need for emergency legislation?

Dr. WAGNER. In my opening paragraphs I made the fact known that our ecumenical commission is deeply concerned about the injustices in the quota system and the injustices in the law, and we would like to revise discriminatory clauses due to race, color, and sex. I know there are other groups here that will be devoting time to that and we feel that there will be a minority of the peoples who present this need for emergency legislation. We wanted to have our case rest pretty heavily on that, as I understand my colleagues have also done.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. What is your view of the national origins system?

Dr. WAGNER. We recommend that it be studied and that they be lessened. The discriminatory clauses due to race, color and sex we would eliminate.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Alfred Fleishman here?

STATEMENT OF ALFRED FLEISHMAN, REPRESENTING THE JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL OF ST. LOUIS, THE JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS BUREAU OF GREATER KANSAS CITY, THE ST. LOUIS AND KANSAS CITY SECTIONS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

Mr. FLEISHMAN. I am Alfred Fleishman, 211 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo. I am representing the Jewish Community Relations Council of St. Louis composed of the St. Louis Chapter of the American Jewish Committee, St. Louis Council of the American Jewish Congress, the St. Louis B'nai B'rith lodges and chapters and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Jewish Federation of St. Louis, the St. Louis Section of the Jewish Labor Committee, the Department of Missouri of the Jewish War Veterans, the Rabbinical Association of St. Louis, Vaad Hoeir (the Orthodox Jewish Council) of St. Louis, the Zionist Organization of St. Louis, the St. Louis Section, National Council of Jewish Women, the Jewish Community Relations Bureau of Greater Kansas City, and the Kansas Section, National Council of Jewish Women.

I have a prepared statement in behalf of these organizations, which I will read, with your permission.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear it.

Mr. FLEISHMAN. Speaking on behalf of these organizations I want to express our appreciation for the opportunity to be heard by this Commission on a matter of such vital importance—important not just to segments of our population—but to all our people because of its relationship to the basic concepts of our democratic tradition.

At the outset it should be made clear that the organizations joining in this presentation do not appear as special pleaders. Their interest lies in the correlation of our immigration laws to democratic principles. This is an imperative—the accrual benefits to any particular group—incidental. Recent history, not necessary to recount here, its tragic results, makes the interest of Jewish groups one of principle rather than one of any special advantage to the Jewish community in the United States or to potential Jewish immigrants abroad.

If democracy is an idea and an ideal certainly its expression in our immigration policies and laws is a reflection of that ideal. At the very least it is a rather basic expression of our practices as distinguished from our preachments.

Codification per se of our immigration laws may be a good thing. But codifying and perpetuating that which is undemocratic—adding to it other measures indicating our disbelief in the dignity of man—can be only a sorry reflection of fears and prejudices. Certainly we must protect our country, its people and its traditions against the criminal, the subversive and the insane. But our immigration policies should be selective, not discriminatory. Immigration is a two-way street of benefits—to the immigrant and to the United States. Who can deny the contributions made to the development of our country by immigrants and their descendants. Such a list would be an endless one. On the other hand, the United States has been able to make tremendous contributions to the world under its general immigration laws. But the letter and the spirit from both viewpoints—that of the United

States and that of the immigrant—must be rooted in democratic belief and practice.

We often approach these problems in high-flown terms of vague generalities. Perhaps a few actual case histories of recent immigrants who came to our community under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948—just simply ordinary folk—would be more to the point.

The A family consisting of a man, wife, 2-year-old child and mother-in-law came to St. Louis about 2 years ago. The man had been a teacher in Europe. He went through a period of about a year before he could be placed in employment. During that time the family was assisted in the amount of about \$1,500 for rental, food, clothing, etc. After that time Mr. A found employment as did his wife. After a lapse of another year they were able to save enough money to invest in a small market and grocery store. Currently they are giving employment to two or three additional people and are repaying the agency for the prior financial assistance.

The B family came to St. Louis in August 1949 after bitter war and postwar experiences in concentration camps and displaced persons camps. Mr. B's father had owned a restaurant in Poland. Within several months he had secured employment as a cook in a Community Chest-supported institution with living quarters attached for himself and his family. He saved what he made and took night courses in cooking and baking. By July 1950 Mr. B used his savings and a loan to purchase a small restaurant. Currently they are employing five people besides Mr. B and his wife, paying off the loan and repaying the agency for financial assistance received.

The C family consisting of three people came to St. Louis in 1949. They too had been in concentration camps and DP camps. Within several months of their arrival, Mr. C was employed by a large firm as a printing shop operator and by July 1950 was earning enough to maintain himself and family.

These few current case histories taken from the files of the local Jewish agencies can be matched, I am sure, by similar reports from the files of the Catholic and Protestant resettlement agencies. These are the stories of people, real people, to whom democracy is a shining ideal—the United States its greatest example.

The national origins quota system adopted in 1924 is not a selective formula—it is a discriminatory one that has achieved acceptance simply by the fact of its use. The need for quantitative controls over immigration does not lead inescapably to the national origins quota system. The latter formula writes into law the scientifically discredited theory of racial superiority. It denies individual merit and upholds anti-democratic theories of group superiority directly contrary to our stated principles.

The basis for selection of those who will be admitted must not be dictated by fear or prejudice. The standards must be those to measure individuals—their needs and their qualifications—within the over-all economic, social and political framework of the United States.

Public Law 414 (McCarran-Walter law) not only codifies the national origins quota system—it extends its racist base. Under its provisions the quota for Great Britain and Northern Ireland will be approximately 65,000—Germany about 25,000—whereas Italy, Greece, and Turkey will have quotas of about 5,500, 300, and 225 respectively.

Such quotas seem to fly in the face of history, contradict the humanitarian purpose of immigration laws, and prohibit the full use of the total number of visas available in any one year. Along with this is the restriction which denies British colonials in the West Indies the use of the quota assigned to the mother country, a direct slap at Negro immigration.

A step forward was the assignment of quotas for the first time to certain Asiatic countries (the "Asia-Pacific triangle"). But what is extended with one hand is withdrawn by the other. Immigrant, no matter where born, who is "attributable by as much as one-half his ancestry" to races in the Asia-Pacific triangle is chargeable to the quota of 100 of the particular Asian country. This is a reversal of the national-origins formula and seems to be devised to emphasize the single criterion of racial ancestry.

The need for numerical control of immigration can be met. An over-all quota figure based on the 1950 census—not on the 1920 census as at present—can be established. Sound standards and preferences can be set up to meet United States economic and security requirements as well as to assure just treatment of prospective newcomers. Thus it will be possible to issue visas to applicants on a first-come, first-served basis just as the British quota is currently administered. This does not mean necessarily increasing the number of immigrants to be admitted. It does mean using the available visas to the best advantage of both the United States and the pool of prospective immigrants. (Public Law 414 goes even to the extent of removing the quota-exempt status formerly held by bona fide college and university professors.)

In addition, it is also suggested that it should be possible to establish a firm and basic minimum number of visas annually with some flexibility upward to meet our own and world needs as they may change and evolve. This would result in the establishment of a long-range immigration policy adaptable to changing world conditions obviating the necessity for piecemeal and emergency legislation.

In discussing our immigration policies deportation is of course a basic concept. Its use as a "banishment" form of punishment too frequently wreaks vengeance on those it does not intend to harm or punish—families, dependents and others. Aliens should be subject to the same equal treatment under the law as citizens. This means punishment for wrongdoing but not the use of "exile."

Deportation for fraud or illegal entry is a consequence that flows directly from the ideals and objectives of a fair immigration policy. Deportation for other reasons means application of law on a class or caste basis. Under Public Law 414 an immigrant is made subject to deportation for a number of acts even though there was no reason to believe or anticipate at time of entry the later occurrence of such personal difficulties either financial or otherwise (sec. 241). The use of the "Damoclean sword" of deportation hanging over the head of the immigrant is an undemocratic extrajudicial procedure at best.

Once naturalized there should be no distinction under law between the native-born and the naturalized citizen. This premise also flows from our traditions—our history—and basic democratic concepts. Under our Constitution and laws a naturalized citizen is not eligible for the Presidency; in all other respects he stands as an equal. This is as it should be. Revocation of naturalization

should rest on a showing of fraud in obtaining citizenship. But Public Law 414 distinguishes between native-born and naturalized citizens seemingly for security reasons (sec. 340). The use of the device of revocation of naturalization is set up as added punishment for those not native-born. Thus, in practice, it would also seem to follow that after revocation of naturalization would come deportation. The variation in treatment, in fact, the creation of different classes of citizens, becomes obvious. The same objection applies to the reenactment into Public Law 414 of expatriation provisions from prior law. Hence naturalized Americans who reside abroad for five years are expatriated, a penalty not applicable to native-born citizens.

Ours is a government of laws. As such, guaranties should exist in law to protect people against administrative arbitrariness. But our immigration law, Public Law 414, leaves much to be desired in this respect. Some of the more obvious gaps are:

1. Extremely broad powers are given to immigration officials, consuls, and the Attorney General's office wherein "opinion" and "satisfaction" of the particular official is made the basis for exclusion or deportation.

2. The President is given the unreviewable right to suspend immigration at any time. Even under prior law he could do this only during war or time of national emergency.

3. The Board of Immigration Appeals no longer has statutory basis, no provision is made for it in the law.

4. Consular officials have an absolute right to deny issuance of a visa. There is no provision for a Visa Review Board where the decision of a minor consular official in denying a visa can be questioned by interested parties.

This Commission undoubtedly will receive many statements dealing with the various detailed provisions and legal aspects of this complicated subject. But certain broad concepts must be underlined. As a democratic nation our immigration and naturalization laws and policies are a large part of our "show window" to the world. These laws and policies articulate our national attitudes toward people. If our laws are humane, liberal, and just, our "show window" is a bright and shining front. But if our immigration laws and policies spring from fear, prejudice, and racism, then our window is indeed a dark and shabby display.

Let's not say to the world that our fears have outrun our beliefs in the dignity of man and the democratic process. On the contrary, the ideal of democracy and the right of each person to be judged as an individual cry out for confirmation as never before in history. Let us look upon immigrants as "new Americans" in the full sense of the term rather than as strangers whom we fear and distrust.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, you are the next witness.

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. L. G. LIGUTTI, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE, DES MOINES, IOWA

Reverend LIGUTTI. I am Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, representing the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa, of which I

am executive director. I would like to read a prepared statement and then add a few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Monsignor LIGUTTI. I was born in Italy. I arrived in the United States, January 1912. I became an American citizen in 1918. I have served as a Catholic priest in various capacities since 1917.

I wish to address myself before this Commission on two specific points:

I

Section 2-b: "Admission of immigrants into this country in the light of our present and prospective economic and social conditions."

Wealth results from the application of human effort and ingenuity to natural resources. When an ample supply of natural resources is available it is desirable to apply an ample supply of human resources for the production of wealth. There is a possibility of reaching a saturation point, i. e., when human resources, because of excessive quantity or improper use, press against a limited supply of natural resources. Then it is clear that human resources should be limited, used more effectively, or moved to some spot on the face of the earth where undeveloped natural resources are available.

It is evident that a considerable amount of restriction in our immigration policies has been caused by fear of overpopulation and the thought that foreigners by their influx would take away jobs from native Americans. Certainly too quick an influx, too unbalanced an immigration might cause local and temporary economic difficulties. However, to state or act upon the assumption that the United States has reached or is nearing a saturation point is quite inaccurate, and it is based upon a completely false economic theory, i. e., the economic pie theory. It goes something like this: The United States is just so big a pie, the less people, the bigger the slice for each person. That sounds very plausible to anyone who is not acquainted with real economic laws of wealth production. The economic pie theory is only valid in an aboriginal economy. So many berries, so many fish, so many bison, the less squaws and braves, the easier the hunting and picking. The pie theory is not valid in a progressive economy where wealth results from the application of human effort and ingenuity to natural resources. Here a job creates another job.

Let us not forget the danger of population pressures, but what economist is here today to say that admitting 150,000 or double that number yearly to the United States might bring about an economic danger?

Others have told you that we need agricultural workers, house servants. In practically every small or large business enterprise, if you ask the question, "Do you need a good man?" The answer is, "We do. Can you get him for us and when?" Let our immigration policy be based upon valid economic laws, not fallacies or popular baseless appeals.

The second apparent cause for our restrictionist policies is founded upon certain so called social desiderata. I quote from a processed release emanating from Senator McCarran's office entitled "Factual Resume." It is undated and unsigned: I have it here with me.

"The McCarran-Walter bill continues in effect the policy of restrictive immigration which was overwhelmingly determined by the people

of this country to be in the country's best interests some 25 years ago. This policy is known as the national-origins-quota system under which the quota for each country is in proportion to the extent of that country's contribution to the total population of the United States as it existed in 1920 and has as its purpose the maintenance of the relative composition of the population of the United States."

Would any social scientist say that through this quota system the hoped for biological situation can be brought about? Even admitting that such relative composition is desirable because of the superior racial qualities of the Anglo-Saxons, an attempt to legislate biological reproduction on a racial or national origins basis is fraught with stupid hopes, undemocratic outlook, and completely against the laws of nature. Our American heritage is not as of one, but as of many. America is a sturdy tree. Its branches and leaves enjoy God's sunshine, rain and breezes, its vigor, health and beauty are drawn from Mother Earth—through myriads of roots. This type of America we beseech God to bless, maintain and prosper.

II

The second part of my testimony will refer to section 2-c: "The effect of our immigration laws and their administration, including the national origins quota system, on the conduct of the foreign policies of the United States."

I have had occasion to travel far and wide throughout the world. I have met many friends of the United States. I have also met people who honestly suspect our motives and our sincerity. I have heard the following statements made: "Hitler tore pages from the United States Congressional Record when he shouted forth his claims of Teutonic racial superiority." "Is democracy, which you Americans present as the salvation of the world, based upon the unity and equality of the human race, or do you define it to suit your own convenience and prejudices at various times and places?"

The work of UNRRA, Marshall Plan, ECA, MSA, and all assistance given to Italy, Greece, Turkey, and other nations have saved Western Europe from communism. The majority of the people there are deeply grateful and appreciative. The implications of the McCarran-Walter bill as they were discussed and analyzed at the end of last June in the continental European press practically erased the great good that has been done. Communist papers headlined the news by, "We told you so." I remember what I saw in "Unita," the Communist paper in Rome. "Fatti maschi; parole femmine"—(Deeds are masculine, words are feminine)—followed by an anti-American tirade.

Of course, the United States alone cannot solve the problem of over-population in Europe or elsewhere. Neither can America open the floodgates of unregulated immigration, but we can do at least four things:

1. Adopt an immigration policy which is democratic and Christian.
2. If a national-origin quota is to be kept, let it be based on the national origins of the boys who gave their lives in World War II and in Korea. That would represent an unbiased standard, and very up to date.
3. Consider and favor in a special way the reunion of families.

4. Help solve the imbalances of population and resources in the world by our leadership, through capital investments and movement of people (PICCME and private agencies).

Gentlemen, the world looks our way today. Civilizations and world leadership change hands as the centuries roll by. There are tides in the fortunes of men and of nations. "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." (Matthew 7: 12.)

Reverend LIGUTTI. That is my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Now, just a few other remarks, which I may insert at the end of my statement. For the ones who deny that the McCarran-Walter bill is discriminatory, it would be well to define the word "discrimination," not merely say "but the bill doesn't say it is discriminatory." Of course, would any of our people perhaps, who at times may be caught stealing or doing anything unjust, say "I am right now committing a sin against this particular commandment of God"? Who is going to admit it? Of course, not publicly, but, remember, define it, and define it well, and be logical and consistent.

If I have a number of 15 children around me here, and I have a nice apple, and I say "Now, my dear children, I am not going to be discriminatory, not in the least." Can't you see me? I don't mean to be discriminatory, and I am not saying I am discriminatory. I am going to cut the apple into 15 slices—no discrimination—but, of course, to Greece, and to Italy, and to Turkey, and to Poland, I am giving the slightest wee bit of a slice, but I will give six-fifteenths of that slice to England; so much to Ireland. But, of course, remember now, I am not discriminatory, not in the least; why, of course not. Did I say I was? Does that make sense? Well, it doesn't.

Besides that, just to say that you don't discriminate, or don't want to discriminate as to color, race, or religion, but you are rather willing to discriminate as far as nations are concerned, don't forget that there is discrimination of that very type by national discrimination. Certainly, no; we don't discriminate because of race in Jamaica. No, of course not; but all the people of Jamaica are colored people, and when you just accept only so many from Jamaica you are discriminating against all people; oh, no, it is only that island which happens to have, of course, all colored people. You don't discriminate against Catholics, of course; no, but Italy is 98 percent Catholic; but, of course, we are not discriminating against Catholics; no, of course not.

Another remark, and it is concerning the cream coming from other nations. Well, brothers, and sisters, the cream of a country doesn't necessarily include only the professionals, or the men who go to universities, believe you me; the cream of this country is not there, even though I am a university graduate. The cream of our country is the ordinary man that works for a living—I am not implying we don't; you understand that—but the cream of Europe that came to this country, the poor fellow that worked with his hands to build the bridges and the railroads, and that went into the mines of this country. Let's be sure to analyze the expressions before we use them. Let's not forget, also, that when South America and Australia, particularly, adopted restrictionist policies, which they did, they follow suit, they followed our example. They adopted them only after we had adopted them because that seemed to be in the air.

Then, the question of applying tests for immigrants into this country. You know what I would like to do? I would like to apply the same tests that we apply for the immigrants coming to this country to our candidates for office, for our Senators, our Representatives, or any other public officials from a physical, a mental, or a moral viewpoint. After all, they are much more important when it comes to this country—the ones who are making laws and who are ruling over us. I wonder if the Senators and Representatives and so forth, and public officials, will be willing to adopt that type of test, or is it too low. I don't want to say that, but it is just by way of comparison, and that's all.

Thank you very, very much.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. I notice by the papers that you have just been in South America, and yesterday in our hearing in St. Paul one of the witnesses, Mr. Ossana, said there has been rather a heavy immigration from Italy to the South American countries, particularly, the Argentine.

Reverend LIGUTTI. Before 1920.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Now, he made the statement that immigration to the Argentine has been cut off.

Reverend LIGUTTI. Yes; it has been.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Quite completely?

Reverend LIGUTTI. Not quite completely cut off. But it is still favored as far as the reunion of families is concerned.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. And would there be no hope for relief of the overpopulation situation in Italy, in South America?

Reverend LIGUTTI. Yes, there is, but we have to give the example, and we have to furnish capital, returnable capital. I do not advocate merely handing over billions and billions even for resettlement of people. For resettlement purposes you can loan billions and billions returnable with interest.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Would it be a little easier for people from Italy to be admitted into the South American countries than from some other countries?

Reverend LIGUTTI. Yes, absolutely, because they in South America have also the prejudices, and we have to take things, you know, as they are. There is no use saying "Well, why are they?" But they are.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. At our hearings in Chicago, a witness suggested, on the basis of a chart covering New Mexico, Arizona, and western Texas, that there is a place for resettling a large number of immigrants by irrigating that region through harnessing the Missouri River for that purpose. I was struck with the impracticality of that approach, and wonder what your views are on it?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. I think we can see the absurdity of that approach. I am just thinking now of the State of Iowa where I come from. There is enough grade A land in the State of Iowa along the railroad tracks and along the highways going to waste—there is more there—than there is grade A land in Japan. I am not advocating people along the railroad tracks, you understand, and I am not advocating an awful lot of land settlements even in this country. We have to consider everything from an economic and social viewpoint. I do think that in the rural districts of America we need good farm workers. I do think that the villages of America have room, each

village, for a few families of people coming from some country outside of America who will do some of the work they are able to do, or that they will be asked to do and the Americans are not willing to do. After all, that is the way America developed.

I am not boasting of my own story, but I worked for \$8 a week and I worked from 7 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock at night except on Saturdays when they let us off at 1:30 o'clock, and that was in 1914. I was a college graduate. There is plenty of room for the types of workers that America needs.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Yesterday we had a witness from the National Farmers Union in North Dakota and in approaching this problem of getting folks on the land he said that there must be a change in the basic concept of agriculture, and that it is a long-range program, and to take immigrants under emergency legislation into this picture presents some difficulty. What is your view of that?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. Of course. However, I think America has had to face other problems and America, whether we want it or not, is the leader of the world today and we must adjust our thinking and our traditions and so forth. We may not be the leaders tomorrow.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Monsignor, the Commission has been given information to the effect that in Iowa the demand for year-round farm hands continues to increase. Do you think that demand is such as to be of a kind which ought to be considered in the placement of persons from overseas?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. Yes.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Is it substantial?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. Yes. But the selection of people from overseas must be done in a sound fashion. Let us not make the mistakes that the Canadians made where they merely said, "Are you a farmer?" The answer was "Yes" and they came into Manitoba. Well, they weren't farmers. They were just the sons, perhaps, of some official who was somehow or other connected. We have to be very selective for the particular jobs, but there are plenty of boys in the mountains of Greece. I was there a few months ago and I was in southern Italy and I was in Turkey. We can get very reliable people. We can find plenty in Syria and plenty of Arabs and there are plenty in Iran and Iraq and Lebanon. Their relatives have made good citizens in the United States and we find plenty of them would be willing to work and make good citizens in the years to come.

I think whilst we should be attentive as not to make blunders, let us not forget that blunders will be made.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. In supplying this farm situation in my home State of Iowa, would there be housing for families or are you thinking in terms of single men?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. No, I am thinking of housing. Don't forget, we have all sorts of vacant houses in the rural districts of Iowa. Some of them are being torn down. Some are dilapidated but they can be fixed up. There is no lack of housing in the rural districts of Iowa or in the Middle West.

The CHAIRMAN. How did these vacancies occur?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. I made this study some years ago. For every tractor that came into Iowa a boy left, and went to make tractors.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the tractors still there?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. That is right. The rural population of all the rural States, particularly Iowa, has diminished. See, we have gone down. Of course, even in the United States we have gone down from 25 to 30 percent from rural farming to 15 percent at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. But if you still have the tractors and machinery, do you need the labor?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. Yes, but you need some fundamental labor, particularly in livestock and in dairying, of course, and even in the field work, as somebody has to run the tractors.

It is a fact that some of these farms are being run directly by people in the city, lawyers and doctors and so forth, who feel that is a good investment to avoid income tax and not to be caught up with it. Then they employ managers and workers on the farms. They are not owners and operators. Actually, they are what they call the owners and operators.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything wrong with that?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. I am not saying there is anything wrong with it, although it would require a great discussion to go into that, because I do think the family-type farm is the best thing for our democracy and I don't think the people in the cities ought to be owning the land and the people in the country working it for them.

Commissioner O'GRADY. But do they need workers?

Monsignor LIGUTTI. Yes; they do and perhaps more than ever before to keep their places up.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Monsignor. Is Mr. Stuart Moore here?

STATEMENT OF STUART MOORE, REPRESENTING THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ST. LOUIS

Mr. MOORE. I am Stuart Moore, 4576 West Pine, St. Louis, Mo. I am representing the International Institute for St. Louis, a community chest agency. I am a staff worker of the institute and the person who should be speaking for the institute today is not in town. That is the reason I do not have a prepared statement.

Might I say that I believe certainly that the staff of the International Institute would underscore and subscribe to most of what Mr. Fleishman and the Monsignor have said, but I understand you gentlemen are interested in having concrete and pertinent suggestions for consideration of the subject you have under deliberation. And I am sorry, sir, I do not come here with any suggestions to you. I have not made a study of this question and I can't give you that help. You may ask me any questions and I will try to answer them.

Mr. ROSENFIELD. Can you tell us something of your experience in your institute and the problem of integrating people into the area in which you serve?

Mr. MOORE. I have had experience here for about 4 years. Of course, we deal with Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. We are an international institute and we all come together there on equal footing. We are not an employment agency. These other organizations are responsible primarily for that, but occasionally different specialized employment problems do come up and we make an effort, and

it is frequently successful, to get these people into work situations. We have found over the years that I have worked there that these people, of course, need security when they come into this city. Many of them have no relatives. Most of them with whom we have been working have no relatives in this city. They do not speak the language and so it is our function to be a place where they can come and find hospitality and a security of meeting with other people who speak their language and who have the same problems.

Last night I was having dinner with a trio of Jewish immigrants from Germany. They will very shortly become citizens of this country, I hope, and they were speaking about the immigration laws. I will try not to speak in exact quotations, but just try to express their feelings. Their feeling was that when they become citizens they still will be second-class citizens because of these deportation clauses in the law. They said, for instance, "Well, now, yesterday we had some coal delivered to our door and our neighbor complained bitterly that the truck driver drove the truck through their yards to deliver our coal. The neighbor, one of them, phoned us and it is feeling that anybody can make complaints and accusations that we are having Communist meetings here and have spoken Communist dogma perhaps, and then we have no recourse and might be subject to deportation by the United States Government even though we have been naturalized citizens."

Well, not being an expert on this question, I tried to allay their fears, but I wasn't too sure about that specific point. We have found in the city of St. Louis that very quickly the people with whom we deal, almost exclusively displaced persons, have become integrated into the community. Shortly after arrival here they get into some kind of work and make little complaints about the housing conditions they find and are willing to accept quickly the fact that they may not be able to go into the profession or the work for which they were trained in the old country.

In our international institute lives a man and his wife who were farmers in Yugoslavia. They are an elderly couple and they have quickly recognized that they could not learn the farm techniques perhaps that they would need to know in this country. They couldn't learn the mechanized ways of farming that we now have in this country, so they went into a different kind of job.

We are working now with an opera singer and a producer of opera. I think he is from Czechoslovakia. He is now janitor in a church and making no complaint at all.

A very well-bred woman from Poland, very cultivated, is now doing janitorial work in a factory. She accepts this as being part of it, "Well, I am 54 years old and I must accept this." She is living a rather happy life.

We have found the integration of these people rather good in most instances.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Moore, if your organization wishes to submit a statement in writing to us for incorporation in the record, please forward it to us at Washington as early as possible.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you, I will inform the Institute.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Yesterday your representative in St. Paul said that declarations of intention to become a citizen, which are

now optional under the new act were submitted and were being returned to their offices as not being required. Have you had a similar experience here?

Mr. MOORE. We don't at the International Institute in St. Louis take those declarations of intention. Those are done by the Catholic and Jewish and Protestant groups or by the Department of Immigration and Naturalization here.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Is there any indication from the Immigration people that they are being sent back and that they are not required?

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have someone from the Immigration and Naturalization Service here who could answer that. Mr. Wirsch, will you answer that?

Mr. WIRSCH. (Immigration and Naturalization Service). They are being sent back due to the fact that they will no longer be required. There is no purpose being served.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Are they on occasion necessary for employment?

Mr. WIRSCH. If there are any specific reasons why a person desires a declaration of intention he can still make application for one, but unless he has some special reason there is no purpose served by making a declaration of intention. When the new law takes effect there will be no necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Moore and Mr. Wirsch. Is Rev. Edward D. Auchard here?

**STATEMENT OF REV. EDWARD D. AUCHARD, REPRESENTING THE
REVEREND DR. RALPH H. JENNINGS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
OF THE SYNOD OF MISSOURI, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, U. S. A.**

Reverend AUCHARD. I am Rev. Edward D. Auchard, 1401 Clara Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., pastor of the local Presbyterian Church.

I am appearing on behalf of Dr. Ralph H. Jennings, executive secretary of the synod of Missouri of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

I have a prepared statement I wish to read, and a statement on United States immigration and naturalization policy approved on March 21, 1952, by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States I wish to submit.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Reverend AUCHARD. The Reverend Dr. Ralph H. Jennings, executive secretary of the synod of Missouri of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., was invited to appear here today. He was prevented by another engagement. Dr. Jennings asked me to represent him, but he did not instruct me what to say.

I have corresponded with the department of social education and action of the board of Christian education of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. Investigation reveals that the general assembly of our church has not made any pronouncements in the field of immigration and naturalization. The department of social education and action has provided the file of material which I have studied in the preparation of this statement. So I am not here to relay any official pronouncements. I do hope that what I say is consistent with the Christian conscience of the church I represent. I believe that it is.

I speak for an institution that recognizes love of neighbor as the highest ethical principle. We are deeply concerned over any violation of persons anywhere when we function in the name and spirit of Christ. We are dedicated to the cultivation of persons in the deepest and broadest sense. We seek to encourage the organization of society in such a way as to secure the maximum benefits for every person as a person.

We recognize that it is not always simple to apply the principle of neighbor-love, especially when we have many neighbors, both near and far, to consider. We also recognize that in the interest of neighbor-love there must be just and orderly procedures in such matters as those that concern this Commission.

This Commission has been instructed by the President to consider three areas:

(a) The requirements and administration of our immigration law with reference to the admission, naturalization, and denaturalization of aliens, and their exclusion and deportation;

(b) The admission of immigrants into this country in the light of our present and prospective economic and social conditions and of other pertinent considerations; and

(c) The effect of our immigration laws, and their administration, including the national origin quota system, on the conduct of the foreign policies of the United States, and the need for authority to meet emergency conditions such as the present overpopulation of western Europe and the serious refugee and escapee problems in such areas.

Those of us who appear here have been asked to designate which area is of greatest interest to us. It is obviously impossible to separate the areas of concern. However, I believe the more immediate, but not the exclusive, concern of the church has to do with one and three, because these most directly and immediately affect persons.

Furthermore, before turning to the more concrete and limited aspects of this statement, I believe we must see clearly that there are closely related issues which must be faced. Overpopulation accentuates the need for immigration. The whole matter of birth rate is therefore apropos.

Certain population movements are normal and natural. However, the present problem involves more than this. It arises out of the great displacement of population due to the war, Nazi and Communist policy, and postwar dislocations and relocations. The cold war makes this abnormal situation a continuing fact of life. The tremendous number of refugees from gross injustice present a special claim on our sympathy and our intelligent concern.

I am sure that all churchmen recognize that in matters of immigration some sort of quota system is necessary. The number must be limited in terms of our ability to assimilate new people. Yet the quota system must be continually reviewed in terms of actual situations and Christian conscience.

One aspect of the new immigration law that Christians heartily commend is the elimination of oriental exclusion, even though the quotas are only token quotas. We can hope for more adequate quotas following our change of national policy.

The quota system, as is well known, gives preference to persons of British, Irish, and German backgrounds whose ancestors, including

mine, came to this country before immigration laws existed. The present quota system may therefore indicate a certain national arrogance on the part of those of us from northwestern Europe that is not consistent with Christian conscience.

The quotas for Great Britain and Ireland are not used up. Therefore Christian conscience in our world of desperate need seems to dictate some means of assigning unused quotas or portions of quotas to other nationalities where the need is great and immediate.

The quotas for many nations from which many refugees and displaced persons have come in recent years are "mortgaged" for years to come—some for more than a hundred years. Yet some of these nations—such as Latvia, whose quota is mortgaged to the year 2274—have suffered especially from both the Nazi and Communist scourge. There seems to be need for study here. Perhaps these mortgages could be paid off in terms of unused past quotas from Great Britain, for instance.

Persons condemned by Communist courts may be excluded admission as criminals, when their only real crime is devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice that are the common heritage of Christendom. There is need for adjustment here.

Limitations on the immigrations of colonial people need to be considered in the light of need and justice. These are often areas of high overpopulation and long exploitation.

Continuing attention needs to be given to uniting families that have been separated by the operation of any quota system.

Consideration might be given to the admission of Arabs to this country in a number not to exceed the number of Jewish emigrants to Israel, with allowance for our limited ability to assimilate people from the Middle East.

The Christian Church is deeply concerned with protecting our society against any Communist infiltration. We are all agreed that refugees must be bona fide refugees—not enemy agents in disguise. Yet we must protect our liberties in ways that are consistent with our tradition of liberty and justice for all.

Broad discretionary administrative powers are granted to individuals in our Government under the present law. Of course, in any administration some discretionary powers are necessary. The church has an interest in seeing that discretionary procedures are carried on in a manner that is altogether fair. Certain criticisms directed against the State Department in this area are already being corrected.

Yet these broad discretionary administrative powers are potentially dangerous. Judicial protection must be given to the rights of individuals or the whole structure of civil rights for all of us may be threatened.

I am very grateful for this opportunity to appear before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. It is important for the people to be heard, and this is a matter of great concern to many of us as a matter of private conscience as well as a matter of social concern. However, the church would be highly displeased to find any political intentions of a partisan nature lurking behind a mask of concern for human rights.

In closing, let me add that I have attached to this statement that I have prepared a statement on United States immigration and natural-

ization policy approved on March 21, 1952, by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., is an active member church of the National Council of Churches. This statement from the national council therefore carries an official weight far beyond all that I have said.

(There follows the statement submitted for the record:)

The plight of the world's uprooted peoples creates for the United States, as for other liberty-loving nations, a moral as well as an economic and political problem of vast proportions. Among these peoples are those displaced by war, and its aftermath; the refugees made homeless by reason of Nazi, Fascist, and Communist tyranny and more recently, by military hostilities in Korea, the Middle East, and elsewhere; the expellees forcibly ejected from the lands of their fathers; and the escapees who every day break through the iron curtain in search of freedom. These persons long for the day of their deliverance and for the opportunity to reestablish themselves under conditions of peace and promise. A problem of equal urgency is involved in the surplus populations that cannot now be supported by the economies of their respective countries. The pressure exercised by these surplus people is of a kind seriously to threaten the stability and well-being of the entire world.

The National Council of Churches sees in this situation an issue that can be resolved only as nations, collectively and separately, adopt policies dictated by considerations not only of justice and mercy, but also of sound mutual assistance.

On the international level, we believe the United States for moral reasons, as well as in the interest of its own economic and political security, should remain steadfast in its purpose to cooperate with other nations in meeting the needs of displaced persons, refugees, and surplus populations. Through the United Nations, the United States contributed generously of its resources in the work of the International Refugee Organization. Likewise, the United States is participating in the activities of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. Our country, through the United Nations, and in other ways, assisted in providing a haven in Israel for many thousands of Jewish refugees. More recently the United States joined with 16 governments in the creation of the Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe. The purpose of this Committee, in part, is to continue, for a limited period, the migration activities previously carried on by the International Refugee Organization.

The National Council of Churches rejoices in the knowledge that the United States, as a member of the family of nations, is a party to these humanitarian endeavors. We believe our country, either through existing agencies, or through a single over-all international body under the aegis of the United Nations, should continue to press for a solution of the many problems related to displaced persons, refugees, and surplus populations. We would vigorously oppose any action by Congress which would hinder, in any way, the operations of these international agencies or which would diminish the participation of the United States in them.

**UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION POLICY—STATEMENT APPROVED
BY GENERAL BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MARCH 21, 1952**

On the national level it is desirable that Congress adopt such emergency legislation as may be required fully to complete the displaced persons program to which our country is committed. This legislation should provide for the admission to the United States of (a) those who were processed under the Displaced Persons Act but for whom visas were not available by December 31, 1951, (b) an additional number of persons of those groups for whom a clearly insufficient number of visas were provided in the original legislation, and (c) our fair share, under proper safeguards, of those who have escaped from behind the iron curtain subsequent to January 1, 1949, the cut-off date specified under the displaced persons legislation. The additional visas here recommended should be authorized within the period ending December 31, 1952, and should be granted without regard to sectarian considerations.

If and when Congress takes action along the lines here indicated, it is our position that no further legislation of an emergency character be enacted. The time is past for dealing with these matters on a piecemeal and emergency basis. Rather, it is imperative that United States policy be now shaped in accordance with the long-range requirements of the problem.

The National Council of Churches has taken note of the fact that legislation is pending in Congress looking toward the revision of our immigration and naturalization laws. We believe it is of the utmost importance that legislation be enacted that will conform with our democratic tradition and with our heritage as a defender of human rights. The adoption by Congress of enlightened immigration and naturalization laws would add immeasurably to the moral stature of the United States and would hearten those nations with which we are associated in a common effort to establish the conditions of a just and durable peace.

We do not propose at this time to pass judgment on the specific details of the proposed legislation, many of which are technical and legal in character. We believe, however, the views hereinafter set forth are in accord with the convictions of our constituent communions.

One. The Congress should make the quota system more flexible. Under existing legislation provision is made for the possible admission to the United States, each year, of 154,000 immigrants. For one reason or another, the quotas assigned to many countries are not now being filled. We believe serious consideration should be given to the pooling or adjusting of unused quotas in order to facilitate family reunion, to provide skills needed in our country, and to offer asylum to persecuted victims of totalitarian regimes. While any permanent solution of the problems of over-population can be effected only by basic economic and social adjustments within the countries concerned, it seems clear that migration opportunities, however limited, can be a helpful factor in easing the tensions occasioned by surplus peoples.

Two. The Congress should complete the process of amending immigration and naturalization laws so that, within the quota system, all discriminatory provisions based upon considerations of color, race, or sex would be removed.

Three. The Congress should establish a system of fair hearings and appeals respecting the issuance of visas and deportation proceedings. It is right and proper that Congress shall approve such precautionary measures as may be required to insure our Nation against the infiltration of individuals hostile to the basic principles of the Constitution and institutions of the United States. We believe this end can be achieved without the imposition of such restrictive measures as would violate the American conception of justice.

We believe the people of our churches would welcome the establishment of a national commission to study with due regard for our international objectives, the problem of population pressures throughout the world, and the possible bearing of these pressures upon our immigration policies.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

We will now recess until 1:30 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., the Commission recessed until 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06352 477 9

